

THE
CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.

No. II.]

FEBRUARY, 1820.

[VOL. II.]

Religious Communications.

For the Christian Spectator.

Discussion of the question—Can a person be the subject of sin and of holiness at the same time?

MUCH has been written on the imperfection of the saints in the present life, and the opinions of controversialists, not only as to the degree in which it exists, but as to its nature, have been very different. Some appear to believe that many, if not all real saints, are nearly perfect in our present state, and that individuals have attained to a state of absolute perfection. Others believe that none are perfectly holy on earth; and probably a majority of the writers of the latter class, not only believe that all fall short of perfection, but that they are exceedingly imperfect, their holiness being vastly disproportionate to their sins.

With regard to the diversity of opinion on the nature of this imperfection, some suppose it to consist only in the inconstancy of holy affections. The view of such is, that at any particular moment, the exercises of a saint are either perfectly holy, or perfectly sinful. Others hold that the imperfection consists in the scanty degree in which holiness exists, even in the best moments of a pious life, and the positive sin with which all our exercises are polluted.

In the discussion of these points, the question at the head of the present article, is frequently involved. It has, indeed, a more direct reference to the *nature* of our imperfection; but it has also a bearing on some of the considerations relating to its degree. It is therefore of some importance to attempt its decision.

Vol. 2—No. 2.

8

The answer which I believe a majority of pious people would give to the question, and which I believe to be a correct answer, is, that *a person may be the subject of sin and of holiness at the same time.*

All who advocate the *negative*, must do it upon the assumption, that there is nothing of a moral nature in man but the *exercises of his mind*. They suppose that neither sin nor holiness consists at all in a disposition, a taste, a relish. It is upon this supposition alone, that there is any scope for discussion on the point; for the moment we admit a permanent taste or relish to be of a moral nature, we must be agreed in opinion, that so long as a man has any remaining propensity to sin, he is unceasingly the subject of sin. Of course, if he become holy, he must be the subject of sin and of holiness at the same time; for none will pretend that the propensity to sin is *eradicated* on the first exercise of holiness.

But granting the correctness of the above assumption, that there is nothing morally good or bad but mental exercises; still I believe the soul capable of both sin and holiness at the same instant; and that in two respects.

I. There is an imperfection in the degree of holy exercises.

II. There is a co-existence of sinful and holy exercises.

In one, if not in both of these respects, I believe that the saint not only *may* commit sin, while in the exercise of holiness, but that such is the general fact.

Those who maintain that a person must be either perfectly sinful, or per-

fectly holy at any particular moment, seem to lay no small stress on a metaphysical argument. They say it *must* be so from the *nature of the soul*. I will therefore take my first argument from the same source; and say, that, so far as I can analyze the powers of the soul, it may be the subject of both sin and holiness at the same time. Take an instance. It is our duty to love God with all the power of affection we possess. Now I see nothing in the nature of the soul to persuade me that I cannot love God in some degree, while my affections are below the intensity of which they are capable. We know that we can love our fellow men with very different degrees of emotion. We can love a particular person much more ardently at one time than we do at another. What reason can be assigned why the same is not possible in our feelings towards God? We cannot, indeed, both love God and hate him at the same time; but that the intensity of our affections toward him admits of an unlimited gradation, seems perfectly accordant with all we can gather from analogy respecting the nature of the soul.

But it has been contended, that we cannot properly speak of sins of *omission*; that sin is positive, not negative; an actual transgression, not an omission of the precept of God's law. Those who hold this language, and prefer to speak of all sin as *actual* transgression, may suppose that it affects the present question; but, with deference, I would ask, if this be any thing more than a discussion as to the propriety of the language to be used? There can be no doubt of our sin, when we fail to love God *with all our heart*. It alters not the thing, whether we call it omission or commission. It is a breach of the divine command. It is a failure in duty. The guilt is unquestionable.

But however clear this point may seem as to one of the respects in which we are viewing this subject, perhaps it may appear doubtful in the other. Although it may seem ra-

tional to suppose the soul capable of an imperfect exercise of holiness, yet it may strike the mind as an absurdity that, at the same instant, it should be in the positive exercise of both sin and holiness. Confident of the correctness of his theory of the human mind, some one may declare it impossible that these exercises should co-exist. They found their theory on the postulatam, *that we can think of but one thing at once*. The decision must turn on the correctness of this assumption. Let us then test its correctness by experience. Let any one scrutinize the operations of his own mind, and see if he does not find the highest possible evidence that he can think of more than one thing at a time—that of consciousness. To me the experiment is satisfactory. It is to no purpose to reply that the thoughts fly back and forth very rapidly from one object to another; so rapidly that we are not sensible of the transition; for if our consciousness cannot detect the transition, what ground have we even to conjecture that it takes place? True, our thoughts pass with great rapidity from one object to another; but how does this prove that they cannot be fixed on more than one thing at once? I can rapidly pass my hand over a number of points in a plain surface; but this does not prove that I cannot place it on more than one at a time. I can rapidly glance my eye over a landscape; but this does not prove the impossibility of fixing it at once on several things; and the science of optics demonstrates that the whole field of vision is painted on the retina, and may be the simultaneous object of inspection.

It is also said, that when we are attending to several things, we cannot have so clear a view of any one object of thought, as when we fix on that solely. But this, instead of refuting, goes to prove that our thoughts are dispersed on different objects; for if the whole mind were centered on one, the perception would be perspicuous, however transient.

But further, if we cannot think of two things at once, how is it possible to compare objects, and judge of their relations? How can I tell whether one thing is larger than another, if I cannot retain the thoughts of both? While a thing is out of my mind, it is the same, with respect to forming a judgment of its relations, as though I had never known it.

If then I can think of different objects at once, I suppose it will be conceded that I can have simultaneous moral exercises. No one will think of confining the affections to a narrower sphere than the range of thought, nor suppose them more tardy in their movements. If I can think of God, and of some finite object at once, I can have a simultaneous exercise towards each. I may also have a plurality of exercises in viewing the same object in different relations. I may consider the propriety with which I am to relieve a beggar, both as it respects the good it would do him, and the use it would be to me; and may have a moral exercise resulting from each of these views. I may also have a further thought—that of the reputation I shall gain by the charity, and a further exercise in view of this third relation.

But now for the remaining difficulty. Though I may have simultaneous exercises, is it not absurd to suppose they can be of opposite kinds? Can the soul exercise right feelings towards one object, and wrong towards another? Must not that state of the soul, or those influences of the Holy Spirit, which cause it to have right feelings towards one object, cause it to feel right to all objects then in view?

I acknowledge that the supposition just made may seem incongruous and may be placed in a light which will give it the aspect of absurdity. But is not this all? And may it not still be true, that opposite exercises co-exist? And may not the apparent absurdity of the supposition result from the known contrariety of good

and evil, rather than from any evidence that they cannot co-exist in the heart of so strange a being as imperfect man? Fire and water are directly hostile, and cannot come in contact without an instant conflict. Yet they may co-exist for a time in the same subject; and if mutually recruited, this war of elements may be sustained and neither exterminate its antagonist. Thus sin and holiness, meet in the heart. An instant conflict ensues; and were not each of them recruited from their original and exhaustless sources, the victory would be as sudden as the encounter. Thus from a mere view of the opposite natures of sin and holiness, we should infer the absurdity of supposing their co-existence; but on a view of the resources by which each is sustained, the absurdity vanishes. All we can pronounce absurd, is, that these antagonists should dwell together in amity—a conclusion which inspiration sanctions. But this absurdity we too hastily transfer to their mere co-existence.

Now, for illustration, take the instance already supposed. I am thinking of God as the bestower of wealth. Here I must have the two ideas co-existing, God and wealth. Towards God, I feel the affections of holy gratitude for the wealth he has given me. Am I therefore free from all sinful attachment to this worldly object while in the exercise of this gratitude? Does my love to God, render it impossible that I should have inordinate attachment to wealth? or does the smallest worldly emotion extinguish my love to God. Take the other instance. With an evangelical desire to do good, I am in the act of bestowing charity on the poor or to spread the gospel. Is it impossible that I should, at the same time, be improperly regarding the honor that will result from the deed? and yet further—may not the money go rather reluctantly from my hand, seeing I still love it? I see not the impossibility of such a case; and that what Ovid says, may

not be the genuine decision of metaphysics on this point—*bonus et sceleratus eodem*.

So far then as the philosophy of the mind is concerned, I feel myself warranted in the belief that it is possible for the soul to be the subject of sin and holiness at the same time; and if this is the conclusion to which a correct view of the phenomena of the mind will guide us, we have now passed the main difficulty on this subject—the chief fortress, that of metaphysics, is taken.

More weighty arguments remain. I therefore observe,

II. That christian experience bears witness to the *fact*. Go to the most eminent saint and ask him if he has never seen the time when he hopes he was in the exercise of true love to God, while, at the same time, he was certain that his affections were greatly below the standard of the divine law. That standard is, that we love the Lord our God with *all* our heart, soul, mind, and strength. Ask if the time has never been when he has loved in a feebler degree than this. He will probably answer, that he never came up to the full requisition. He will declare his *consciousness* of deficiency, and if your arguments convince him that all his exercises must be either perfectly holy or perfectly sinful, it will be singular if you do not shake the foundations of his hope, and lead him to exclaim—as for myself, my fancied piety is nothing—at best, it has been imperfect—I am yet in my sins.

Ask the good man, also, as to the other view of this subject—the fact of his having exercises positively sinful mingled with those which he deems pious. Propose the cases already adduced respecting a simultaneous love to God and to the world; and respecting his feelings in the gifts of charity. Ask him if his experience does not confirm the truth of what we have seen *possible* in such cases. Whenever he has had any true love to God, has the world always been perfectly crucified to him, and he to

the world? And in his deeds of charity, has he always acted from the full and undivided feelings of his heart? with a total disregard of human applause? with an entire freedom from idolatrous reluctance? Take another christian duty. He loves his children, his friends, and the church. Is there never a selfish ingredient mingled with his benevolent feelings towards these objects? Put another concise question. When he rejects a temptation, does he always do it with his *whole heart*? with no improper desire for the pleasurable sin? with the holy disgust that our Saviour manifested? One question more. May not the feelings be right towards one object while wrong towards another? Towards an object where the temptation is great, may they not be wrong, while they are not so towards other objects? While I cast an unforgiving eye on a man who has injured me, is it impossible that I should feel any thing better than a selfish emotion towards my friend who is standing by his side?

In this way perhaps we might go through with the whole catalogue of moral affections and find the testimony of experience, so far as it can be ascertained, in favour of the affirmative of the question.

Let it not be objected to the testimony of experience, that the transition from perfect sin to perfect holiness, is so rapid that we cannot perceive it, and therefore can give no testimony on the point. The *existence* of such transitions must first be proved; which, from observations already made, I conceive impossible. But aside from these observations; let us for a moment attempt a microscopic view of the point on which the objection rests. Grant the reality of these rapid transitions, and that the imperfection of the saints consists *only* in the inconstancy of their good exercises. Why is the christian more active for the cause of truth at one time than at another? The state of health and many other natural causes may indeed exert an influence on the

natural spirits, and on the clearness and brilliancy of the conceptions, and thus, in a measure, modify the religious affections. But this influence is nothing, when brought to account for the great difference in the degree of spiritual life, that is so manifest, not only in the case of an individual, but of a whole church at different times. How then shall it be explained? According to the supposition, for a moment, the soul is perfectly holy; and then, in the succeeding moment, perfectly sinful. The transitions are very rapid, like the inconceivably swift vibrations of a pendulum. On this theory, the only way of accounting for the fact in question, is, by making the further supposition—that when there is but little zeal for religion, the periods of sin are longer than those of holiness, the process of vibrations is going on in such a manner, that the soul is two-thirds, three-fourths, or nine-tenths of the time in the exercise of sin; and when the soul is quickened in divine life, the vibrations incline the other way, and the periods of holiness become the longest. I give this illustration of the theory on which the objection is founded, not to ridicule, but to explain my view of it. It seems to me an excessive refinement in theory, to believe that such a process is going on in the soul—and to believe it without evidence. I cannot therefore deem the objection built upon it against the common apprehension of christians respecting the nature of their imperfection, of any avail.

To give further force to the argument from experience, I observe, that it is incredible, if the periods of perfect holiness exist, that they should not occasionally be of sufficient duration to afford a consciousness of their existence. It is incredible that the bad emotions should always succeed the good with such rapidity, that the mind should be forced to view them as blended. Why should not the period of perfection be occasionally prolonged for a minute, an hour, or a day? And if it be supposed that this

actually takes place, we may presume that saints must know it. Angels are conscious of their perfect holiness. Adam was conscious of the same before his fall. Why should not a man now be conscious of it, if the subject of such perfection? And why especially should he not be conscious of it, since the transition from total sin is instantaneous? When Satan fell, he was conscious of the awful change. The instant Adam fell, he doubtless *knew* that he was naked. What less is the transition now between perfect holiness and sin? If then, men are the subjects of such a change, why do they not know it? But since eminent saints, as well those who are inspired, as those who are not, give us no such account of themselves, it is incredible.

The voice of experience seems to be, that the saint is never perfectly holy; and perhaps never perfectly sinful. He does not run *greedily* and totally in the ways of sin, like the impenitent. While in this life, he always groans, being burdened with sin—he is always contending with spiritual enemies; and there is ever found in him some good thing towards the Lord God, that causes him to feel the burden, and prompts him to the conflict.

III. It was my design to remark on a number of passages of scripture which have an influence on the present question; but the length of this paper requires an apology, and I will close with a brief hint on two texts, and a single remark on that class of passages which are supposed to favour the hypothesis I am opposing. What paraphrase can be given of the command to love God with *all* our heart, *all* our soul, *all* our mind, and *all* our strength, which shall not recognize our liability to a culpable deficiency in holy love. This emphatic passage seems fully to sanction the position, that saints may be imperfect in the *degree* of their holy exercises. The other passage is in the seventh chapter of Romans, where Paul speaks of the war in his members, and declares

that when he would do good, evil was *present* with him. Let the reader attentively consider the whole passage, and see if it does not prove the co-existence of opposite moral feelings warring in the same breast. It is the less needful to adduce a multitude of other texts in proof of these positions, as it is presumed they are familiar to most of your readers.

On those texts which are adduced to prove that we must be either perfectly holy or perfectly sinful, it seems needless to remark, that the writers of them appear to have no intention of inculcating a microscopic theory of inconceivably rapid and total transitions in our moral feelings; and of course they can support no such theory. Christ seems to contemplate no such theory in what he says of serving God and mammon—and of the same fountain not sending forth sweet water and bitter. He teaches that good and evil cannot spring from the same source—and that we cannot be supremely devoted to two opposite objects; that in proportion as we are devoted to the one, we must be alienated from the other. This seems the obvious amount of these passages, on which the greatest reliance is placed by those who advocate the negative of our question. They do not however affect its decision. V.

For the Christian Spectator.

On making a public profession of religion.

It were to be wished that all who are the true disciples of Christ would openly and publicly espouse his cause. This however, has probably not at any time been done. A few individuals may be found in almost every place, who in the judgment of charity are pious, but who have never united themselves to any christian church. The reasons for this neglect may be presumed to be various, but the following, I believe, are those which are most usually assigned by the individuals themselves.

1. That they cannot be satisfied

which of the different denominations of christians to join.

Surrounded by a variety of sects, one crying "Lo! here, and another lo there," they apparently become confused and bewildered, and hardly know what to do. They would be willing perhaps to unite themselves to some denomination of christians, if they only knew which was right; but this point must first be established. The misfortune of such often is, that this point never *becomes* established. Like certain others, of whom the scriptures speak, they are ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. Thus they waste away a whole life in doubt without ever coming to a decision on a question of so much practical importance. Though it is important, that they should proceed with caution in a matter of such moment—though it becomes them to weigh well the doctrines and practices of the different religious sects; still they ought not to spend all their days in this state of suspense. After due deliberation, it is their duty to decide and to act.

2. Friends are opposed to their making a profession of religion.—It may be that those friends are opposed to religion itself; and that they positively forbid the enjoyment of the privilege under consideration.—Irreligious husbands have sometimes thus restrained their wives, and irreligious parents their children. For the sake of peace christians thus situated, have sometimes neglected to profess religion, and perhaps have felt themselves excused from the duty of professing it. But have they not erred? Does not their conduct savour too much of a temporising spirit? Is it not obeying men rather than God? Is it not, in a sense, denying Christ before men? Do they not manifest an unwillingness to take up the cross and follow him? Though a real christian may, for aught I know, be guilty of this sin, as well as others, for a time, yet perseverance in it would, I think, be inconsistent with true godli-

ness. It is a declaration of our Lord, which ought to be remembered by such that "He that loveth Father or Mother more than me is not worthy of me; he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me: he that forsaketh not *all* that he hath cannot be my disciple. But those who are inclined to join the church are sometimes deterred by a different kind of opposition, arising not so much from hostility to christianity as from other causes. A woman, for instance, feels it to be her duty to make a profession of religion. Her husband objects, not on the ground that he is opposed to the profession itself, but because he is unwilling in the matter of religion to be forsaken by his wife. Hoping he shall one day be prepared to unite with her in the performance of this most interesting duty, he desires her for the present to postpone it. How far it may be the duty of christians under such circumstances to *wait*, I will not take upon me to decide. I would however suggest whether *waiting* in cases of this kind, instead of producing the desired effect, of exciting the person on whose account it takes place, to greater preparation, does not often lull him into still deeper security in sin?

3. They wish to avoid the charge of professing religion from selfish motives. Not ignorant of the fact that multitudes both in ancient and modern times have professed Christ with the basest views, they are aware that an union with the church in their case might be attributed to unworthy motives. This excuse, too common, I fear, among a certain class of men, is far from being sufficient. It is founded in the pride of the human heart. It justifies the omission of a duty, on the ground that the performance of it might expose one to shame. Did St. Paul refuse to own his Saviour before men, through fear of scandal? He doubtless knew that his former companions would indulge the same uncharitable spirit towards him, that he had once indulged towards others.—

But this circumstance had no weight in his mind. He had counted the cost and was willing to sacrifice his worldly reputation and honour, and if necessary, his life too, that he might win Christ.

4. They cannot bring their feelings to perform certain duties expected of churchmembers. Though the same obligations rest upon the people of the world as upon the members of the church—though the former are equally bound with the latter to lead lives of prayer and self-denial, and to keep themselves unspotted from the world, yet, after all, more is expected from those in the church than from those out of it.—This is evident from the fact that a single crime committed by a professor of religion attracts more notice and observation, and occasions more severity of remark than a multitude committed by those who are not professors. Let a man of the world, for example, use profane language, and little or nothing is thought of it; but let a church member do the same, and his sin is at once noised abroad through a whole village. The same is true of sins of omission. Many duties may be neglected without censure, by one not belonging to a church; but how soon and how severely are similar neglects reprobated in the professor of religion? Now it is this circumstance which has laid a foundation for the excuse under consideration. Those who shelter themselves under it, know that family prayer, for instance, is a duty, which they could not omit, were they professors, without discrediting their profession; and not being able to bring their feelings to a performance of it, they finally conclude to neglect that of joining the church also.

5. They are dissatisfied with the church in the place where they live; and particularly so, perhaps with certain of its members. It may be that they are offended with the church for neglecting discipline.—Some of her members may have gone astray, and no proper measures have

been taken to restore them. Or perhaps the church entertains some opinions, or justifies some practices which are thought to be unwarranted by the word of God. But, in none of these cases, will the reason be found sufficient, unless it appear that the church is really so corrupt as to cease to be a church of Christ. The Apostles censured most of the churches to whom they addressed their epistles; some for one thing, and some for another. But were any of these churches so faulty as to render an union with them improper? If a church be in a low state, it is good reason, why those who are truly pious should become its members; that by their influence and example, they may "strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die." In some cases the dissatisfaction is not with the church as a body, but with individual members of it. From these members, personal injuries may have been received or the person under consideration may have witnessed things in the conduct of such members which are inconsistent with the spirit and temper of the gospel. Suppose all this to be true, does it furnish a sufficient reason for neglecting the duty in question.—Must we unite with no church which is not perfect? Where can such an one be found? Not surely among those formed by the apostles. Nor that church perfect of which our Lord, in the days of his flesh, had the special oversight. Some churches doubtless possess more purity than others; but it is to be feared that there are bad members in them all. The tares cannot be entirely separated from the wheat until the harvest. The objector then may enquire, "Is it my duty to join a church, with some of whose members I cannot hold fellowship? Most certainly, if you believe it to be a church of Christ. You cannot, it is true, have communion with those members for whom you have no charity as christians; but you can commune with the church *generally*.—You can embrace, in the bonds of christian affection, such as you deem

true disciples. Does not Christ, I ask, hold fellowship with a church, although it may contain some wicked members? and why can you not do the same? If these wicked members can be excluded from the church on scriptural ground, they certainly ought to be excluded; if not, their continuance in it furnishes no excuse for not joining it.

6. They may be deceived as to the state of their own hearts, and therefore, in celebrating the ordinance of the supper, they may eat and drink damnation to themselves. We ought indeed to be jealous of ourselves with a godly jealousy, since our hearts are naturally deceitful, and desperately wicked. Still it is believed that whoever will seriously attend to the operations of his own mind, and compare them with the word of God, the unerring standard of christian feeling, may ultimately be able to determine satisfactorily whether his hope be well founded or not. It is not absolutely necessary that a person should *know* assuredly that he is a child of God, before he unites himself with the church. This may be done with propriety, if, after due examination of his case, he allows himself to *believe* that he has been born of God. But what, it is asked, if after all, he should come to the table of the Lord without religion? I answer, he would be in the same condition as if he had never joined the church—in a state of condemnation and wrath. He would sin in going to the communion table without religion; and he would have sinned, had he stayed away without it. Whether the sin of going be greater than that of not going, will depend on circumstances. There seems to be a sort of impression on the minds of some, that receiving the Lord's supper unworthily is an *unpardonable* sin; as if it sealed for ever the damnation of those who were guilty of it. This is undoubtedly a false impression. It probably originated from a declaration of St. Paul, in his first epistle to the Corinthians: "He that eateth and drinketh unwor-

thily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." But St. Paul's design in this passage was to reprove the church at Corinth for converting the Lord's supper into a common meal. This he termed eating and drinking unworthily. By eating and drinking in this manner, he assured them that they ate and drank damnation, i. e. judgment to themselves, not discriminating between the bread and wine used to represent the body and blood of Christ; and the same elements, when used at a common meal. This, it is true, was a great sin; and unless repented of, would expose them to endless ruin; still it was by no means unpardonable. Should a person then commune at the table of the Lord without piety, he would not thereby render his salvation impossible. He would still be a subject of calls, invitations, and warnings, as well as other sinners.

7. I would add, that there are others who do not profess religion, lest they should dishonor the cause of Christ. The tenderness of conscience manifested by such, cannot be too highly estimated. Happy for the church if it were felt by all its members! Besides, it may be considered as one of the best evidences that a person is qualified to enjoy sacramental privileges. He who really feels a tender solicitude for the honor of Christ, will be a welcome guest at his table; nor will he be apt to give the enemies of God occasion to blaspheme. On the other hand, the man who feels no anxiety lest religion should suffer by means of his professing it, who seems to say, "I am strong; I shall never be moved," betrays his ignorance of his own heart, and to say the least, renders his piety questionable. It is however, deserving of the consideration of those who are excusing themselves from a religious profession for the above mentioned reason, whether there is no danger of dishonoring Christ by an omission of duty. To such I must say, "you are afraid you shall offend

Christ by coming to his ordinances; have you no fear of offending him by staying away from them?" It is as truly sinful to omit a duty, as to perform it amiss. It was not for an *abuse* of his talents, but for neglecting to improve them, that the slothful servant was condemned.

My observations on this subject shall be brought to a close, by suggesting a few considerations, as motives to a public profession of religion. Let it here be distinctly understood, that I am not addressing any who are in an impenitent state. Far be it from me to offer inducements to such, to come to the table of the Lord; and if, by any means, they should find their way thither, let them remember that they are spots in the christian feast; guests without a wedding garment. It is indeed their duty to *profess* religion; but it is their duty *first* to *possess* it. God has no where required us to be hypocrites; to profess our faith in Christ while we have none; to tell the world that we love him, while we are his enemies. My business is solely with christians, and christians out of the church, who, for the reasons above mentioned, or some other, have never publicly professed the religion of their Saviour.

The *first* motive which I would offer for the consideration of such, is, that a profession of religion will lessen the number of their temptations.—While they are out of the church, they are considered as belonging to the world; since they have, by no public act, renounced their attachment to it. As such, in their intercourse with men, they will be apt to be treated. The wicked will more frequently entice them to sin. The very circumstance of a person's being a professor of religion, is commonly sufficient to ward off the temptation to evil company. This profession forms a kind of bulwark, which the ungodly fear to attack. These persons, however, have no fortification of this kind: they lie open to the assaults of their enemies on every side. This is not all. An union with the

church will not only lessen the *number* of their temptations, but strengthen them to resistance when tempted. A regard to consistency of character will deter them from sin. Their brethren in covenant will rally round them in every season of trial, and, if possible, hold them back from dishonoring God.

2. By professing religion, they will exhibit more light as the disciples of Christ. Now their light is in a measure concealed. If their conduct in other respects be ever so exemplary, still in this, it is defective. A small cloud will intercept the rays even of the sun; so this spot upon their christian character will obscure the light of graces really possessed, and of an example perhaps in all other respects praiseworthy.

3. By professing religion they will enjoy more of its consolations. The way of duty is not only the way of safety, but also the way of comfort. How often is God enjoyed in his ordinances! How many have sat down at the sacramental table, and found its provision sweet to their taste! Of this happiness these persons deprive themselves. Not only so, but they expose themselves to fall into a state of spiritual declension, and, of course, to have less of the comforts of religion generally. To preserve their graces in exercise, christians need to be attentive to *all* the means of God's appointment. But some of these means they neglect. What else then can be expected, but a decline of religion? In every revival of religion, a greater or less number of persons come forward and make a public profession of their faith, as apparent subjects of the work, who, nevertheless, date the period of their conversion years before. Not being united with the church, they by degrees had lapsed into lukewarmness and sin, till their piety was apparently lost, and their hopes extinguished.

4. By neglecting to profess religion, they refuse to comply with the dying request of the Saviour. Just before his death, he instituted the ordinance

of the supper, and enjoined the observance of it upon all his followers. What can be plainer, what more affecting, than his language? "This do in remembrance of me." Did the Lord Jesus Christ require, as a test of our love to him, that we should perform long pilgrimages, or offer costly sacrifices, we might with more plausibility excuse ourselves. But he demands of us nothing but what we are all able to render. He simply requires that we eat bread and drink wine, in commemoration of his sufferings and death. If a dying friend whom you value, were to give you a token of his affection, however small, would you not preserve it as precious? And when the Redeemer of your souls, a friend to whom you are indebted for your dearest comforts, your best hopes, says to you, "Do this in remembrance of me," can you refuse to comply with his request? Where, then, is your love? By neglecting this duty, do you not *offend* your Saviour? Has he not somewhat *against* you, because you do not publicly espouse his cause; and will you not repent of this omission? I have known many christians on their dying beds express much grief that they had not joined themselves to the church of Christ; and thus testified to the world, that they were not ashamed of his cross. And in instances not a few, they have begged the privilege of doing, at the close of life, what they have then acknowledged ought to have been done years before.

A. S.

For the Christian Spectator.

Exposition of Psalm cx.

Argument. This Psalm celebrates the greatness and prosperity of some Jewish king, whom Jehovah invites to sit with him on the throne of Israel, with the assurance that all his enemies should be subdued under him; verse 1. His dominion, by the blessing of God, is to be extended beyond its original

limits, and to sway hostile nations; verse 2. The forces of this successful prince are represented as ready for service, well disciplined, and exceedingly numerous; verse 3. Jehovah solemnly engages that he shall be a worthy successor of the venerable Melchisedek, and like him an acceptable priest of the Most High God; verse 4. The writer then announces destruction to those kings that oppose Jehovah's favoured prince; verse 5. For this king shall take vengeance on the hostile nation, and with a most dreadful slaughter, obtain a decisive victory over them; verse 6. And unfatigued in the pursuit follow the enemy with impetuous courage; verse 7.

Verse 1. *The LORD said unto my Lord, "sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool."*

The LORD here is *Jehovah* (יהוה) in the original Hebrew. My Lord is my *Adon*, (אדון,) a title which is often given to kings by their inferiors. See 1 Sam. xvi, 16. xxii, 12. 2 Sam. ii, 5, 7. 1 Kings i, 13, 17, 18, 31. What king is here intended will be considered hereafter. The literal rendering of the first clause is: *the oracle of Jehovah to my Lord*, which is, in some sense, a caption to the whole Psalm; but the impassioned style of the sacred penman, has led him, by an abruptness of transition, which is not unfrequent in eastern writings, to terminate the direct form of the oracular address at the end of the first verse.

The words of Jehovah begin thus: *Sit thou at my right hand*, that is, (Jehovah being considered a sovereign,) *on my throne at my right hand*. The throne of the LORD, I conceive to be the *throne of Israel*, as in 1 Chron. xxviii, 5. and in other places. To be seated on the right hand of a king is sometimes a mark of honour and respect merely, as in the case of Bathsheba, 1 Kings ii, 19; sometimes it denotes a partici-

pation of regal power, as in the case of the Apostles James and John, Mark x, 37. (compare verse 42.) The latter is undoubtedly intended in the Psalm before us. The invitation of God then is: *Administer with me the government of Israel*.

Jehovah subjoins: *Until I make thine enemies thy footstool*. The metaphor here employed will be sufficiently evident, if we compare such passages as Ps. viii, 6. xviii, 38. xlvii, 3. and consider that it was an ancient custom of conquerors to place their feet on the neck of the vanquished. See Josh. x, 24. We must not here suppose that the subjection of the enemies is to limit the reign of the prince, whose praises are here celebrated. The particle *until*, in the original Hebrew, has not necessarily any such force. Compare Gen. xxviii, 15. Deut. vii, 24. Ps. cxii, 8. The idea is, that the king should reign till his enemies were conquered, *much more* after that event.

The common English translation of this verse, is, however adequate to convey every idea which has been here suggested.

Verse 2. *The LORD shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies*.

The sacred penman, though still perhaps delivering the oracle of Jehovah, by a bold apostrophe, addresses himself to his Lord, and speaks of God in the third person. The *rod* here is a regal *sceptre* as in Jeremiah xlvi, 17. Ezek. xix, 11, 14. A *rod of strength* by a well known Hebraism is a *powerful sceptre*. The *rod of thy strength*, by another Hebrew idiom, means *thy powerful sceptre*.—Thus *temple of thy holiness*, in the original is rendered by our translators *thy holy temple*, Ps. cxxxviii, 2, and in other places. To *send* a rod is to *stretch it out*, as the same Hebrew word is rendered Gen. xlviii, 14. Mount Zion is Jerusalem, or *the seat of power to the Jewish nation*. *Rule thou*, in the imperative mode, follow-

ing in this connection a verb in the future tense, may be properly rendered *thou shalt rule*. Compare Ps. cxxviii, 5. Gen. xlv, 18. in which passages our translators have made this change.

The whole verse may be rendered thus: *Jehovah shall extend thy powerful regal sceptre from Zion and thou shalt rule in the midst of thine enemies*. The sense is: *Thou shalt reign not only here, but over other nations also*.

Verse 3. *Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth*.

Our translators appear not to have understood this verse. To aid the sense let a semicolon be placed after *holiness*, and the colon after *morning* be erased.

The Hebrew word rendered *willing*, is derived from a verb which is sometimes applied to soldiers who *volunteer* their services in the cause of their country. See Judg. v, 2, 9.—The word itself in this place is a noun in the *abstract* form and *plural* number. *Thy people shall be readinesses*. The plural is probably a plural of *intensity*, and the clause may be translated thus: *Thy people shall be ALL readiness*. The abstract is used, (as frequently is the case,) for the *concrete*. The sense then is: *Thy people shall be all ready for service*. The word rendered *power* means in several places *military forces*, as in Deut. xi, 4. 2 Kings vi, 15. *The day of ones power* then, when speaking of a military commander, is *the time of drawing out his forces*. The phrase rendered by our translators in this place and in Ps. xxix, 2. xvi, 9. *beauties of holiness*, according to the ablest interpreters, means *garments of holiness*, or, following the English idiom, *holy garments*. The first part of the third verse may be put together thus: *Thy people shall be ready in the day of drawing out thy forces, and clad in holy garments; that is, thy people*

shall be ready for service, and properly equipped when thou callest them to fight.

In the latter part of the verse *youth* means *young men*, (the third sense of the word as given by Dr. Johnson.) The morn is represented as producing from its fruitful bosom those numerous drops of dew which are discovered at break of day. Compare similar images, Job xxxviii, 8, 28, 29; and the following passage of Cicero, (De Divin. i, 8.) “*Quum primum gelidos rores aurora remittit*.” A copious dew is often used as an emblem of *multitude*. See 2 Sam. xvii, 11, 12. Mic. v, 7. The preposition rendered *from* should be rendered *more than*, as it is in a hundred instances; and after the preposition, an ellipsis of the word *dew*, which is in the other member of the sentence, is to be supplied. Compare similar ellipses, Ps. iv, 7. Is. x, 10. Job xxxv, 2. I will give a more literal and then a more paraphrastick interpretation of this part of the verse: *More (in number) than (the dew of) the womb of the morning shall be to thee the dew of thy youth; that is, Thy chosen soldiers shall be more numerous than the drops of morning dew; or as Dr. Watts has very beautifully rendered it,*

“And converts, who thy grace obey,
Exceed the drops of morning dew.”

Verse 4. *The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, “Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek.”*

The sacred writer, having in the second verse left the direct form of the oracular address from Jehovah, finds it convenient to resume the same with the solemn preface: *Jehovah hath sworn and will not repent*, that is, *never change his purpose*. Compare Num. xxxiii, 19. 1 Sam. xv, 29. As to Melchisedek, it is not probable, that the Israelites, at the time this Psalm was composed, knew any thing more of his history than what is recorded in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis. All that is there said is

highly honourable to his character, and extremely interesting to the descendants of Abraham. He reigned on their very Mount Zion, he was a friend of the father of the faithful.—To his princely dignity he added that of being a priest of the Most High God, and who can doubt, that he was accepted of him. To resemble this venerable and pious prince, and like him to be a priest of Jehovah, was no small honour. *Thou shalt, whilst thou livest, be a priest like unto Melchisedek.*

Verse 5. *The Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath.*

As after the first oracular prediction in verse 1, the poet addressed himself to the Jewish prince, and spoke of Jehovah in the third person; so now after the second oracular prediction in verse 4, he addresses himself to Jehovah, and speaks of the Jewish prince in the third person. The meaning is sufficiently clear. *The Lord at thy right hand, in the day of his wrath,* (that is, when excited to punish his enemies,) *shall smite down hostile kings.*

Verse 6. *He shall judge among the heathen, he shall fill with the dead bodies; he shall wound the heads over many countries.* This verse may be paraphrased thus: *He, the future Jewish king, shall take vengeance on the hostile nations, he shall fill with the dead bodies of the slain, he shall smite down the persons of his enemies over extensive fields.* The sense is, *He shall obtain a great and decisive victory.*

Verse 7. *He shall drink of the brook in the way, therefore shall he lift up the head.* That is, not delayed in the chase by fatigue or thirst, *he shall drink of any obvious brook, and assume new strength* to pursue the enemy without remission.

Two very important and interesting inquiries now suggest themselves.—To whom does this psalm relate? and is it to be taken in a more literal, or in a more metaphorical and spiritual sense?

Among the various answers of the motley host of commentators to the first inquiry, we mention the following:

1. By some, according to Justin Martyr and Tertullian, it was referred to Hezekiah.

2. A. C. Borhek, a writer in Eichhorn's *Allgemeinen Biblioth, der biblischen Literatur*, vol. vi. p. 315, 11, supposes this psalm to relate to king Solomon.

3. Munting, Pfeiffer, (*Prolusio in Ps. cx.* Erlang, 1801,) Rosenmuller, the son, and perhaps many others, refer this psalm to David, and to that period in his life when he took the castle of Zion, and made it the royal residence. See 2 Sam. v. 6. 11. 1 Chron. xi. 4, 11. According to these critics, it was written by some person who wished to honour his sovereign, and to celebrate that joyous event. The reference to Zion in the second verse, and to Melchisedek in the fourth, admit, on this supposition, of a very easy solution.

4. The celebrated Prussian Jew, Mendelsohn, who has been styled the Jewish *Locke*, and who died in 1786, supposes this psalm to relate to David, and to the time when his army, under the command of Joab, took Rabbah, the royal city of the Ammonites. 2 Sam. xii. 26. This rests solely on the supposition that the word *rabbah*, (rendered *many*,) in the 6th verse, is the proper name of a city.

5. A Swedish writer in Gabler's *Neuesten Theol. Journal*, p. 536, refers it to the time when David was perplexed and disheartened, by the rebellion of his son Absalom, 2 Sam. xv. xvii.

6. Aben Ezra refers it to the time when David having narrowly escaped with his life, *his men swore unto him, saying: Thou shalt go no more out with us to battle, that thou quench not the light of Israel.* 2 Sam. xxi. 15—17.

7. Rabbi Saadiah Gaon, and some other Jews of modern times, have considered the psalm as *prospective*,

and referring to the expected Jewish Messiah.

We cannot enter into an examination of these different opinions. We acquiesce in the sentiment of the last named Jewish Rabbi, that the psalm was prospective, and related to the expected Messiah. In our own view, also, it has had its fulfilment in Jesus of Nazareth. Our reasons for believing it a prophecy of the Messiah, are the following :

1. The title of the psalm, which, on account of its Chaldaic appearance, we conceive not to be coeval with the psalm itself, is probably, however, more ancient than the time of our Saviour. This title attributes the psalm to David, as its author. If David was the writer, then surely he celebrates not himself, but some other, who was much his *superior*.—Some critics, I know, have interpreted the title differently, so as to mean *a psalm concerning David*. Familiarity with Hebrew idiom, will, it is thought, make such an interpretation appear very unnatural.

2. From the conversation of our Saviour with the pharisees, which is recorded, Matt. xxii. 41. Mark, xii. 35. Luke, xx. 41. it is evident that the latter referred to the Messiah. Though we would not vouch for the critical acumen of the Jews of that age, yet this fact will shew that even those conversant with the Hebrew dialect, *could* with some plausibility apply it to the Messiah, and that if others (christians for example,) do the same, it is not owing *solely* to their ignorance of that language.

3. The manner in which our Saviour quotes this psalm, *how then doth David*, IN SPIRIT, (which in this connection can mean nothing else than *by divine inspiration*,) *call him Lord*, forbid us to believe that he is merely arguing with the pharisees on their own principles. We infer, on the contrary, from these words of our Saviour, both that David was the writer of the psalm, and that it related to the Messiah.

4. I can discover no insuperable

objection to this application of the psalm. As a professed disciple of Christ, I must reject those other interpretations, which appear to me inconsistent with the truth of christianity, the direct arguments for which I am unable to resist.

We come now to the second inquiry. Is this psalm to be taken in a more literal, or in a more metaphorical and spiritual sense ?

The latter is the opinion which I have adopted. The psalm has, in my view, a higher and spiritual meaning. As this may appear inconsistent with the secular aspect which has been given to the psalm in the preceding interpretation, some remarks will here be necessary.

1. There are several expressions in this psalm, which, taken by themselves, *admit*, but do not necessarily *require* a more spiritual meaning. Thus, in the first verse, *sitting at God's right hand*, and in the second verse, *Mount Zion*, might, if we were guided only by the usage of New-Testament writers, living one thousand years afterwards, appear to have a *celestial* application. See 1 Pet. iii. 22. Mark, xvi. 19. Col. iii. 1. Heb. i. 3. xii. 22. Rev. xiv. 1. But such a restriction of these phrases is not justified by the usage in the time of David. In the third verse, most readers attach a spiritual sense to the phrase *beauties of holiness*. This is owing partly to a mistranslation of the original, and partly, that we are no longer conversant, like the Jews, with that external holiness which consisted in ceremonial cleanliness.—In the fourth verse, *a priest for ever*, may mean, by itself, an *eternal* priest, but when I consider that the phrase *for ever*, is applied to a servant's serving his master, as in Deut. xv. 17, I dare not say that it must have that meaning in this place. The union of the offices of priest and king took place, in some measure, in David, it ought also to be considered, as well as in Christ ; for David new modelled some of the religious institutions of the Jews. The turn of expression

in the remainder of the psalm, is evidently secular, and this has been the inducement for giving the whole an uniform secular appearance.

2. The interpretation of this psalm which has been given, though secular in its outward garb, was not intended to shut out the more spiritual and metaphorical explanation. Most of the language, it will be found, is capable of a more extended signification. Thus the writer of the psalm might call an *earthly* prince *his Lord*, but the title would not be inapplicable to a person of a *much more elevated* character. The throne of Israel, or the dominion over God's people, may designate that people when they become much more numerous. *All thy life long*, when applied to an earthly monarch, would be but a short duration; but appropriated to a *celestial* being, it corresponds with the duration of his existence. The same reasoning may be applied to the other phrases.

3. I will express my views yet further. The description is a description of the Messiah. But David sat for the portrait. It is a flattering likeness of him. Every striking feature in the son of Jesse is enhanced and beautified. We may say with propriety, behold, a greater than David is here. The Messiah, according to the prophecy in Deut. xviii. 15, was to be a second Moses, now he is to be a second David. It was thus that the Messiah was pictured to the ancient Jews, from what they regarded with the highest reverence. How else should he be described? Should a poet use abstract language? Should

a writer, who wishes to instruct, forget that his hearers are creatures of sense?

4. It is not unlikely that this psalm, in its original Hebrew dress, may have made different impressions on those who first received it, according to their natural temperament, and especially according to the strength of their religious feelings. The worldly-minded Jew, with the spirit of the kindred Arab, would have thought of little else than a bloody and victorious prince, and would delight his imagination with the prospect of vengeance and plunder from his enemies. The pious Israelite, who felt that the glory of David's reign consisted not in the victories which he gained, but in the protection which he afforded to the church, and the influence which he exerted in the cause of piety, would easily conceive of a very different character. He would not believe that mere external prosperity would meet the approbation of God, or that Jehovah's anointed would be a mere earthly hero. He would examine this and other prophecies of the Messiah, with a religious feeling and taste. Through such a perspective, every colour in the portrait would receive a brighter hue; the prince, whose bloody hands were pronounced unfit to build a temple for the Lord, would become a prince of peace; David, with all his adultery and murder, would be lost out of view, and a pure and spotless son of God, would appear triumphing by the aid of divine truth, and blessing the world with the knowledge of the one true God.

U. V.

Miscellaneous.

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.

SIR,

ALLOW me to consider another objection from the Old Testament, to the pacific system of christianity.

It is alleged that the principle of war is recognised in the infliction of capital punishments for murder;—a practice which is supposed to be divinely authorized, even if the temporal sanctions of the Theocracy are

done away, because the taking of life for life was commanded before those sanctions were revealed. In other words; it is supposed that the law for taking the life of the murderer, is of earlier date than the Theocracy—that it is not a part of that economy, and not being expressly repealed, is therefore of perpetual obligation.

The passage of scripture chiefly relied on, is Gen. ix. 6: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." This ordinance, as delivered to Noah, the Patriarch of the new world, when society was to be organized by him, is selected in preference to any repetitions of it subsequently recorded, that the inculcation may not be classed with the peculiar institutions of the Jewish state.

I do not apprehend it can be necessary, for the present purpose, to show that the Theocracy actually commenced immediately after the Deluge—that some of its fundamental principles are contained in the revelation to Noah, others in that to Abraham and the Patriarchs who followed, and finally that the system was not completed till the days of Solomon. But it will be appropriate to enquire whether this passage confers authority and imposes obligation upon man.

1. It obviously has not the form of a command, specifying and enforcing a duty; but rather that of a decree, importing the purpose of him who spoke, and the agency by which it should be effected. *Your blood will I require*: at the hand of *man*, will I require it. Whoso sheddeth, &c.

2. It appears to convey no part of the liberty granted to Noah and his posterity upon that occasion. The liberty of eating flesh was given; the eating of blood was forbidden: then follows what relates to the shedding of human blood.

3. The reason assigned for the appointment announced in this passage, relates to Him alone who gave life, and who had a sovereign right to take it away; and implies no obligation or

duty on the part of man, without a special command from the same authority, making him the executor of the threatened and fatal visitation. The murderer was to be slain, not to make an atonement to society, not in pursuance of what is called justice by civil laws; but solely for his sin against his Creator and his Judge. 'In the image of God, made he man; therefore would he require the life of him who shed man's blood.'

It may be observed that this ordinance was proclaimed at the commencement of a new and peculiar dispensation. No trace of a similar announcement, anterior to the deluge, can be discovered. Indeed, that nothing of this nature, was then authorized in any form, or justifiable on the part of man, is strongly implied in the case of Cain, and in the sentiment expressed by Lamech, the father of Noah. Yet, that murders were then perpetrated, and that men assumed the right of putting murderers to death, is not improbable; at least, this would imply no greater depravity or impiety than they appear to have been guilty of in other respects. At the opening of this new and extraordinary dispensation, we behold the Creator of the world announcing himself in a new character, and publishing a rule by which he would deal with men as their *civil*, and at the same time as their *moral* governor: namely, that he would punish men in this life for certain moral offences against Him, and make man his agent in administering certain inflictions upon the guilty. The first example of this, is contained in the passage under consideration, where the great Giver of life asserts his sovereign right to take it away, and his purpose so to do, under certain circumstances, through the instrumentality of man, and by violent inflictions. To this, numerous instances were subsequently added, all proceeding upon the same rule.

I conclude, therefore, that God required the life of the murderer, not on account of the injury he had done

to society, nor on account of any benefits to be secured to his fellow men by his death; but on account of his impiety towards the Creator of all. The propriety and justice of the appointment were to be sought, not in the relations of man to man, but in the moral and eternal relations of man to God. The punishment was thus ordained upon the same grounds as that which is to be inflicted upon the wicked at the final judgment.*

In support of this conclusion, I shall give a short illustration of the impiety of murder and of the peculiar aggravations of it under the typical dispensation.

1. Man's shedding the blood of his fellow, was the greatest impiety against God, considered as the author of life and the arbitrator of its destinies. It was a contemning of his power—a trampling upon the work of his hands—an act of open and desperate rebellion against him, as the proprietor of the creatures he had formed, and implied an assumption of his prerogatives. The extreme turpitude of this deed, however, does not appear, till we reflect, that there was that in the person murdered, on account of which he was declared to have been made in the image of God. The violation of that life with which the Almighty Creator had incorporated his image, seems the most direct and most awful indignity that could be offered to the Majesty of heaven.

2. But this impiety was aggravated in the highest degree, by circumstances relative to the doctrines and forms of religion. This is intimated, especially, by the stress which is laid on the idea of *shedding* blood, and by all the commands and prohibitions relative to *blood* when shed.

* The design of the punishment was, no doubt, in one respect different; namely, as a type of the punishment to be inflicted upon the impenitent in the world to come. For it is not more apparent that the sacrifices under the Jewish economy from the time of Noah, typified the great atonement by Christ, than that the temporal rewards and punishments of that period, prefigured spiritual and eternal rewards and punishments.

That some moral reference of high and solemn import was suggested by the idea or the fact of shedding blood, cannot, I think, be doubted.—“Flesh, with the life thereof which is the *blood* thereof, shall ye not eat. And surely your blood of your lives will I require,” (as the penalty for eating blood,) “at the hand of every beast will I require it; and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso *sheddeth* man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed.”

To me there remains no doubt but that here, as in numerous passages of a later date, reference was made to the *shedding* of the *blood* of that atonement, which was typified by the sacrifices both before and after the flood, and the inculcation of which, from this period, was a more prominent and public object of their religious rites.* In that atonement was centred all that was substantial and important in the patriarchal and Jewish worship. The necessity of looking to that as the foundation of their hopes and the end of their faith, was taught by the ceremonial which guided their sacrifices, and by the severe enactments which guarded those rites from profanation.

By sin, man had forfeited the divine favour, and rendered himself obnoxious to the punishment denounced upon transgressors. But by the shedding of Messiah's blood of atonement, the way was to be opened for the forgiveness and salvation of repenting sinners. This accordingly was revealed to man, and illustrated by typical sacrifices, from the days Adam to the incarnation and sacrifice of Christ. Now the nature and high importance of this atonement, and the manner in which it was by divine ap-

* Before the deluge, there was no occasion to prohibit the eating of blood, for animal food was wholly interdicted. The shedding of blood was therefore less common, and the liability to sin in this respect much smaller, than would naturally be the case after the change of dispensation and the allowance of flesh for food.

pointment, typified, could not fail to give a kind of sacramental solemnity to the shedding of blood, and to invest that occurrence with a degree of sacredness and awe, due to no other event. Blood was consecrated as the standing symbol of that sacrifice, which was to provide for the deliverance of men from the curse of the law of God, and to raise them to the blessedness of heaven. Every association of thought, therefore, and every religious sentiment and feeling, the dread of evil, and the hope of good, would turn upon the solemn and mysterious import of the *shedding of blood*.

Such was the fact; as may be inferred from a variety of passages which exhibit the aggravated nature of irreverence, profanation, and every species of mal-conduct touching this subject.

1 From the reasons assigned for the prohibition of eating blood. Levit. xvii, 10, &c. ‘And whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eateth any manner of blood, I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people. *For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls, for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.—Therefore I said unto the children of Israel, no soul of you shall eat blood, neither shall any stranger that sojourneth among you eat blood.* And whatsoever man there be of the children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, which hunteth and catcheth any beast or fowl, that may be eaten, he shall even pour out the blood thereof, and cover it with dust, for it is the life of all flesh—whosoever eateth it shall be cut off.’

Nothing, surely, could be forbidden in stronger, or more alarming terms; nor can it well be made plainer that the sin of eating blood consisted in the impious profanation of what had

been consecrated to a sacred purpose.

2. It is declared, in the same chapter, of him who should kill a beast, and not bring it to the door of the tabernacle, that the priest might sprinkle the blood upon the altar of the Lord, &c.—that “blood shall be imputed unto that man; he hath *shed* blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people.”

3. The same reference, and the same implication is made, where the undeviating execution of the laws concerning murder is insisted on. Numbers, xxxv. 33. After the taking of any satisfaction for the life of the murderer is forbidden, it follows: “Ye shall not pollute the land wherein ye are; for blood, it defileth the land; and the land cannot be cleansed of the blood that is shed therein,” (or as the margin has it: “There can be no expiation for the land,”) “but by the blood of him that shed it.”

4. Again, we learn the same fact from the atonement enjoined in case of uncertain murder, Deut. xxi. 1. &c. where the elders of the city nearest to the man found dead were to sacrifice a heifer, and wash their hands over the victim, to expiate the blood which had been secretly shed.

5. The same allusion appears in the sprinkling of blood upon the doorposts at the passover in Egypt. It was a figure of the atonement. “When I see the blood, I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt.” Ex. xii. 13.

6. Also in the consecration of the priests, and of every thing employed in the religious services, by the *sprinkling of blood*. Ex. xxix. Heb. ix.

These examples may suffice to show how the guilt of *blood-shedding* was aggravated by its reference to the doctrines and forms of religion, and especially to the fundamental doctrine of atonement.

Thus it appears to me, that the reason for the appointment announced in the passage under review, was simply

the impiety of the murderer against God the Creator, and, through the peculiar economy of religion, against God the Redeemer; that there was no difference between the grounds of this and many other capital punishments under that dispensation; and that the passage itself conveys no authority, and enjoins no duty—at least when disconnected from the peculiarities and ceremonials of that dispensation.

I suppose it cannot remain a question whether this passage means the same when delivered to Noah, as when repeated to Moses, any more than whether the prohibition of eating blood is of like import in both instances. And if any thing further were required to establish the above conclusions, it is supplied by the fact that the *eating* of blood, and the *shedding* of blood, are placed upon the same footing, and forbidden upon the same penalty. The result is, that if the other capital penalties of the ancient dispensation are done away, so is that for murder, and neither individuals nor governments have any authority from the word of God to take the life of man.

Yet some may imagine that human governments cannot exist without this authority. But do they mean that they cannot carry on war and bloodshed without it? or that they cannot do that which is right, without doing that also which is wrong? Is there such a necessity of the power of life and death, as to create a divine warrant for assuming it? Is the end of such a nature as to justify the means? or is the argument of this necessity a mere assumption, and of such force and authority as to deter even those who believe the bible, from inquiring into it?

L.

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.

SIR,

WE often hear severe animadversions on the inconsistency of professing christians, from those who are unfriendly to the doctrines of the gos-

pel. It is said, they call themselves disciples of Christ, and profess to receive those rules which he has given to regulate their conduct, “and in all things to walk as having him for an ensample.” At the same time, it is said they live as other men do; that they are as worldly, as proud, as selfish, as fond of pleasure, as those who make no pretensions to religion. It is much to be regretted, that some professors give occasion for such remarks. They may be applied with propriety to many who have named the name of Christ; and the unthinking and slanderous, who wish for some excuse for their neglect of religion, make application of the inconsistencies of some professors, to the whole body.

It is useless to protest against this injustice. In vain do you point them to the humble and devout disciple, who adorns the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things; and exhibits “the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit.” Their eyes are fixed upon characters of a different description, and they are willingly ignorant of the declaration of the apostle, “that all are not Israel who are of Israel.”

At the present day there appears to be a mighty effort on the part of some professors of religion, to break down all the distinctions between the church and the world. These persons we suppose to be really as much “of the world,” as if they had never professed Jesus Christ. If we judge them by their fruits, we must conclude that they are “of the world.” They adopt its maxims; pursue its pleasures, and seek its honors. Their conversation is entirely of a worldly nature. You may be in their society from week to week, and never hear them express a single sentiment on the subject of religion. You will often perceive them foremost in advocating those amusements which serious christians have ever deemed improper and sinful.

I had recently an opportunity to see the inconsistency of which I have been speaking very strikingly exem-

plified. I was present at the dedication of a house for public worship, in a place where many of the first characters are distinguished for their refinement and politeness, as well as for their liberal way of thinking upon the subject of religion. The religious services were solemn. Something of the same awe possessed my mind, which the Patriarch Jacob seems to have felt, when he said, "how dreadful is this place; surely this is none other than the house of God, this is the gate of heaven."

The consideration, that the house where we were assembled, was about to be dedicated to the Lord Jehovah, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, that there the people of God would assemble from Sabbath to Sabbath, to bow before the footstool of mercy; that in that house sinners were to receive "a message from God," and through the means of his word and ordinances to be prepared for his holy kingdom, filled my mind with pleasing sensations. Most cordially did I join in all the prayers which were offered for the prosperity of the Redeemer's cause among the people, who were to worship statedly in that place.

After the services of the sanctuary were over, and I had refreshed myself at the house of a friend, who was a member of the church, a card was presented me to attend a ball in the evening, with the assurance 'that it would be very splendid.' My astonishment was very great, and I let fall some expressions, which, no doubt, seemed rather rude and bigoted, to a person of enlarged and liberal views. My friend, however, preserved his good nature, and began to rally me upon my narrow and puritanical sentiments in religion. He said the occasion was a joyful one, and there could be no harm in closing the services of the day in the ball room. I felt my situation peculiarly embarrassing. I wished to maintain the firmness and dignity of a follower of Christ, and I wished also to treat my

friend with civility and respect. I frankly told him that I disapproved of dancing on any occasion; but on such occasions as the ordination of a minister, or the dedication of a house of worship, it was in my view highly improper, especially for christians. He appeared to be a little displeased that I would not consent to accompany him to the ball, though I have no doubt that he respected me for this instance of consistency in my conduct. I was credibly informed that at this "splendid ball" a number of the members of the church were present, and also one of the deacons, "dancing to the sound of the viol," as a kind of preparation for commemorating the sufferings of the Redeemer, in the ordinance of the supper, which was administered to them on the next Sabbath.

Now, sir, I would ask, how we are to view such conduct? Does charity require us to consider those as meek and humble followers of Christ, who run to the same excess in pleasure, with the sensual and profane, merely because they profess Christ before men? If it be proper for professing christians to attend balls, theatres, card parties, and all other amusements which are common in "the fashionable world," I would ask how we are to understand the assertions of our Saviour, that "his disciples" are not of the world, even as he is not of the world? What meaning are we to attach to the various injunctions of the apostles, such as, "be not conformed to this world," "be ye holy in all manner of conversation," "walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing," "let your conversation be as it becometh the gospel," &c. &c.

I am far from supposing that the professed disciples of Jesus, should never mingle with the men of the world; that they should never relax from the sternness of piety, if I may be allowed to use such an expression, by uniting in the cheerful and pleasant conversation of the social circle. But I cannot reconcile an entire con-

formity to the world, an indulgence in all the excess of vain pleasure, with real piety.

When I see professing christians, "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God;" when I see them give an habitual preference to the company of light and trifling persons, and eagerly running to those circles of dissipation and folly, from which chaste and heavenly conversations are excluded, I feel constrained to say, "how dwelleth the love of God in them?"

Perhaps Mr. Editor, my views on this subject are a little clouded, by the *puritanical* atmosphere which surrounds me. I may be a little bigoted in my ideas of that *consistency*, which all will acknowledge, should characterize the followers of Jesus Christ. If so, I hope that some of your able correspondents, will clearly point out to me and to many others, who read your excellent miscellany, what that "conformity to the world" is, against which we are warned in the scriptures.

By doing this they will greatly oblige many whose consciences will not allow them to follow "the course of this world," but who feel constrained to bear testimony against it.

R. S.

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.

SIR,

In your number, for December, we have "Remarks," not in the most edifying measure savouring of the meekness of wisdom—"upon the Sermon delivered at the late Installment at the tabernacle in Salem." To answer them in detail, or to discuss the point upon which they would seem to have been intended chiefly to bear, is not the present purpose. The point has been here for a long time in quietude; nor is it at all apprehended that its repose will be disturbed by the remarks. It seems proper however that an impression, which a part of them is calculated to make upon rea-

ders unacquainted with facts, should be prevented or effaced.

"The circumstance," says the Remarker, "that this Sermon was delivered at the Tabernacle in Salem, cannot but be noticed as one that aggravates the aggression:"—the *aggression*, in offering sentiments on the subject of the churchmembership of children, different from those of the Remarker and others. He proceeds, giving some account of the Tabernacle Church, its ancient standing, its order, and its steadfastness, and closes the paragraph in the manner following:—"Now when one of our pastors goes into a church thus established, and preaches down their professions, solemn covenants and agreements, what shall we say! Could the most daring revolutionist do more?"

His next paragraph is much in the same spirit and tone. "I can offer however," he says, for this subversive attempt a small apology: it was doubtless known to the preacher, that the senior pastor at the Tabernacle agreed with him in his views; and that he had made attempts to bring his church off, as to these articles from their primitive establishment; but it is believed, that with all his talents and with all the auxiliary strength that has come forward on his side, he has not succeeded so far, to this hour, as to induce them to change, in these respects, their written articles of faith. So true it is, that creeds and confessions of faith 'create a rugged warfare to the invader.'"

All this is sufficiently dreadful; but the following simple statement, though less rhetorical, is not less true.

It is painfully remembered by many, and by no one probably more painfully than by the Remarker, that by the immediate predecessor of the "Senior pastor at the Tabernacle," "professions," "agreements," and doctrines, novel and strange to the church, were introduced and attempted to be established; and that agitations consequently arose, which issu-

ed in his dismissal. In no long time after his dismissal things returned to "their primitive establishment," and tranquility was restored. The "Two Discourses on God's gracious covenant with Abraham and his seed"—from which, doubtless, and the "Serious and candid Letters to the Rev. Dr. Baldwin," in support and furtherance of the same sentiments, the Remarker supposes the "preacher" of the Installation Sermon had learned, "that the senior pastor, at the Tabernacle agreed with him in his views," were published at the desire of the church, affectionately expressed in a *unanimous* vote.—Between the senior pastor and the church, there has been, on the point in question, no strife, no disagreement.

And so far as is known, no member of the church thought or imagined at the time of the installment, that "one of the pastors" from a neighbouring State was "preaching down their confessions, solemn covenants and agreements;" or has since thought or imagined, that he came here in the spirit of a "daring revolutionist," or that any thing in his Sermon militates at all with "their primitive" or present "establishment."—On the contrary, he received from the church a warm expression of their gratitude, with a request of a copy of his sermon for publication; and he is held by them in high and affectionate esteem and respect, as one of those who, in these eventful times, *seem to be pillars*. L. R.

Salem, Mass. Jan. 1820.

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.

SIR,

The following observations were made during a fortnight which I passed in Lower Canada in the summer of 1818. Should you think them worthy of a place in your Magazine, they are at your disposal. Z. X.

The Island of Montreal which is 30 miles in length, by 12 in breadth,

is formed by the river St. Lawrence, which divides into two channels about 200 miles north east of Lake Ontario. The city bearing the same name is situated on this island in lat. $43^{\circ} 30'$, long. 73° W. of London, on the north-west bank of the eastern branch of the St. Lawrence. This Island is 500 miles from the union of the river with the Atlantic. The Charter of this Island was given to some French emigrants, who about the year 1620 commenced the settlement. They were directed by their charter, to build the city at the termination of ship navigation, and literally obeying their instructions, they erected their buildings opposite the rapids of the river. These rapids which are three miles in length by two in breadth, form the harbour of the town. The current is from four to six miles an hour, and frequently detains vessels several days from coming up to the city. Generally the passage is effected by the aid of oxen stationed on the shore.

That part of Montreal bordering on the river is elevated about twelve feet above the water, on a bank which is cut down in a direction nearly at right angles to the surface of the stream, and at a distance, resembles the wall of a fortification. From the centre of the city towards the river, the ground presents a considerable declivity, exhibiting a view of most of the tops of the buildings from the river. From the centre the site continues nearly a level to the mountain. Montreal is built principally of stone, procured from Mont Royal, about two miles west of the town. The walls of the buildings are from two and a half, to three feet in thickness, and in case of a siege would afford a considerable defence against cannon. The stone of which they are composed, is carbonate of Lime, of a dark blue colour when first taken from the quarry, but after an exposure of a few months to the atmosphere, it changes to a light grey. In all the public and in many of the private buildings these stones are cut into regular blocks, and

make a handsome appearance. The other buildings are composed of rough stones, covered with a cement of the same colour, which is indented in the form of squares, and at the distance of a few rods, cannot be distinguished from those whose exterior is stone. The windows of most of the houses are divided perpendicularly and open in the same manner as a double door, and are supported by hinges on which they turn.

All the public and many of the private edifices have their roofs covered with tin, exhibiting a *brilliant appearance*. The buildings are very compact, of two and three stories in height. A few of the inhabitants are beginning to build of brick, but as yet there are not more than from thirty to fifty buildings of that description. The streets with the exception of Notre Dame, and a new street near the College, are so narrow as to make it difficult for two carriages to pass each other excepting on a walk. Most of them are badly paved, the side walks not being more than from two to three feet in breadth, which renders it difficult for two persons to walk upon them abreast. The principal streets are St. Pauls and Notre Dame, in which and on the docks, most of the business of the city is transacted. The wholesale merchants principally reside in the former, which is the "Pearl Street" of Montreal. Notre Dame is broad and well paved, containing besides the public edifices, many handsome private buildings. In this street are most of the fancy stores, and its appearance is much superior to that of any other in the city. These streets run parallel with the river, and are more than a mile in length; they are intersected by many others obliquely and at right angles.

The commerce of this town is very great, having rapidly increased during the last ten years. Ships arriving at Quebec are under the necessity of unloading half of their cargoes before they can proceed to Montreal, owing to the numerous shoals in the St. Lawrence between these cities. The

distance which is but 180 miles, is not accomplished under several weeks. To remedy this evil they have introduced Steam Boats on this river, so constructed as to carry freight. These boats are on an average twenty-four hours in descending the river, and about twice that time in returning. The number of Ships that arrive at Montreal has much lessened since the introduction of steam navigation; still many vessels pursue their snail-like course, up the river to this city, where discharging their cargoes they partially reload for Great Britain and complete their lading at Quebec. In consequence of the difficulties experienced in navigating this river, it is seldom that a vessel can make more than one voyage to the mother country in a year. The British Government have adopted the same restrictive system towards the Canadas, which they have so long exercised towards their other colonies, requiring them to import all their goods through the medium of Great Britain. This is executed with so much rigour, that the productions of the East and West Indies, which find their way into the province through the United States, are always confiscated when discovered. This Colonial system extends not only to the productions of a foreign country, but also to those of their own islands. In this manner the inhabitants of the Province, not only have to pay the duty exacted by the Government, but likewise the profit which the British merchant charges on the article. An additional duty of 2 1-2 per cent is paid by the Canadian merchant, who making his advance on all these charges is compelled to vend his goods at a much higher price than the same productions are sold at in the United States. In consequence of these difficulties which the merchant of the province has to contend with, all articles with the exception of those manufactured in Great Britain or Ireland, are sold from 15 to 20 per cent higher than in our cities on the Atlantic.

The trade of Montreal is principally

carried on with the North and North-western parts of the states of Vermont and New-York, and with Upper Canada. The productions sent from these states, and from the upper province, are, grain, pork, beef, ashes and lumber. In return, they take the fabrics manufactured in Great Britain into the states. Into the upper province they carry all the articles of foreign manufacture, in addition to those manufactured in the mother country. These last articles are not brought into the states, as they can (unless they are smuggled,) be procured on much more advantageous terms at Boston or New-York. The trade of this city during the last war was much more profitable than either before or since that period, although it has increased in amount since its termination. The merchants are principally Scotchmen and emigrants from the United States. The latter have increased very much in number within a few years, and have in several instances accumulated large fortunes. The jealousy which exists between these two classes of merchants is very great, the former viewing our countrymen as interlopers, who are attempting to supplant them, while they regard the Scotchmen as very wealthy, and exerting all their energies to destroy them. They make up in enterprise what they want in capital, and contend for every inch of ground. Their influence is rapidly increasing. The inhabitants from the United States who are now residents in the city, amount to two thousand. There are but two banks now in the province, one of which is under the direction of the Scotch, the other is managed by the emigrants from this country. The trade between this city and the United States has been very profitable to the Montreal merchant, until within two years, since that period they have found it less lucrative, in consequence of the numerous failures in this country.

In this city is established the celebrated North-West Company, which has been so long employed in the fur

trade. This company was incorporated in the year 1783, since which time its capital and commerce have greatly increased. There are at present about one hundred partners and clerks, some of whom are stationed at Montreal, and at different depots among the Indian tribes. Others are occupied in conveying goods to these stations, and from thence back to the city. The capital employed by this establishment is immense, and by many they are supposed to be very rich, while in the opinion of others, if all their debts were liquidated, they would become insolvent. They have in their employ from fifteen hundred to two thousand Canadian *voyageurs*, whose business is to convey goods to their various establishments. These articles consist of trinkets, fine cutlery, arms, ammunition, and various kinds of cotton and silk fabrics. They have three rows of settlements, one up the Ottawas, on Ottawas river; another up the St. Lawrence to Kingston, thence crossing to Lake Huron, where the settlements commence, and extend along Superior and some distance down the Mississippi; the third and last is along the Red river, west of the lake of the woods.

The clerks belonging to this establishment leave Montreal in separate companies, with from twenty to thirty of these *voyageurs* under their command. They pursue some one of these routes in their birch canoes, as far as practicable, when unlading their barks, they carry them, with the goods, to the next water course, where they reload their canoes, and pursue their way by water, until they are compelled to leave them behind.— They visit the various establishments on the route, leaving the goods which they take with them as they are wanted. To visit all these posts, and return, employs them seven years, a campaign which each clerk has to serve before he can become a partner. The goods carried by these *voyageurs*, with the exception of the muskets, are packed in bundles of cubic form, each of which weighs ninety-six lbs.

They are pressed very compactly together by a machine, and then covered with canvass, to protect the goods from the wet. One bundle is allotted to each voyageur, who, when they arrive at a carrying place, divide the provisions, cooking utensils, &c. among them, and with this increased load, they will go from twenty to twenty-five miles a day. So inured are they to hardship, and their strength is so much increased by habit, that they encounter the difficulties to which they are exposed in the forest, without a murmur, living on the coarsest food imaginable. They usually rest at the various stations on their route, where they recruit for a short time, and leaving some of their burden, continue their march to those stations which are more remote. The depots most distant, are on, and west of the Red river, (twelve hundred miles from Montreal,) where, unloading their freight, they return laden with furs. The articles carried from Montreal are sold to the Indians at an exorbitant price, while those purchased of them are procured for comparatively nothing.

These voyageurs intermarry with the Indians, their families residing somewhere between these stations and the city. They are buried in ignorance, and are but just elevated above beasts of burden. Their children in their infancy remain with their mothers, but when arrived at mature years, they devote themselves to this employment, in which they usually continue during life. They are completely under the control of the clerk, who accompanies them, and by him they are chastised as often and as severely as he pleases. Their great happiness is found in visiting Montreal, where they remain several weeks

after they have returned from one of their western expeditions. Here they afford much amusement to the populace in spearing fish, and in paddling their canoes. Six or eight of them will place themselves in a canoe, and with their short paddles will move through the water at the rate of from thirteen to fifteen miles an hour.—The boats are round on the bottom, and covered with bark, which renders them so smooth, that they pass over the water without much resistance. The canoes, which weigh from thirty to sixty pounds, draw so little water, that a person unaccustomed to them could not guide them, without being in great danger of upsetting; still the voyageurs are able to balance them with so much exactness, that they remain perfectly true when moving with this great rapidity.

(*To be continued.*)

For the Christian Spectator.

The Evening Cloud.

SEE yonder cloud along the west,
In gay fantastic splendor dress'd;
Fancy's bright visions charm the eye,
Sweet fairy bowers in prospect lie,
And blooming fields smile from the sky
Decked in the hues of Even!
But short its evanescent stay,
Its brilliant masses fade away,
The breeze floats off its visions gay,
And clears the face of Heaven.

Thus to fond man does Life's fair scene
Delusive spread its cheerful green.
Before his path shine Pleasure's bowers,
Each smiling field seems dress'd in flowers,
Hope leads him on, and shows his hours
For Peace and Pleasure given—
But one by one his hopes decay,
Each flattering vision fades away,
Each cheering scene charms to betray,
And nought remains but Heaven.

C. B.

Review of New Publications.

REVIEW OF GRIFFIN ON THE ATONEMENT.

(Continued from page 33.)

Having examined the distinction which Dr. Griffin makes between the obedience and the atonement of Christ, as founded in the principles of the divine law, we now proceed to consider the other arguments, by which he attempts to support this distinction.

His first argument is derived from the import of the Hebrew word כפר and of other similar terms as used by the LXX, and the writers of the New Testament. He says,

"Atonement is a word wholly derived from the Old Testament. It is a translation from the Hebrew word כפר. It is agreed that כפר, signified a *covering*, because the thing denoted was a *cover for sin*."—p. 13.

"We have therefore no authority to call any part of Christ's influence an atonement, but that which constitutes the cover for sin."—p. 14.

"To atone in every one's mouth, is to make reparation for an injury or amends for an offence. To cover sin is a figurative expression and plainly means no more than that sin is so far hid from view, that it is not to be punished."—p. 15.

We have no objection to the import which the author ascribes to the original terms translated atonement. Still the question remains, what is necessary so to hide sin from view that it is not to be punished, what is necessary to make reparation for the injury done and amends for the offence committed by the sinner; in other words, what is necessary to constitute a כפר for sin or an atonement. If obedience be necessary to constitute a cover for sin, it constitutes a part of the atonement. The import of the Hebrew word then, so far from determining, that the atonement does not include the obedience of Christ, seems rather as Dr. G. has explained the term, to lead to the op-

posite conclusion. For how shall the injury done by sin be repaired, without an obedience in the surety to supply the failure of obedience on the part of the sinner?

The other arguments of the author in support of the distinction before us, are derived from *the end* to be answered by an atonement. This end, we regard as the turning point of the whole controversy, and on this part of the subject we propose to extend our remarks, perhaps beyond the patience of our readers. Our apology is, that we find ourselves wholly unable to reach the object of our present discussion, by contributing either to correct what we deem erroneous or to harmonize conflicting opinions, without exhibiting our views of this fundamental part of the subject. Before presenting to our readers the theory of Dr. Griffin we shall attempt to unfold the principles on which rests the necessity of an atonement as the ground of divine favour to the guilty. And to give greater clearness to our views as well as for the sake of conformity to what we deem the prevailing mode of thought on the subject, we shall consider it in reference to the justice of God.

In all our contemplations of the moral attributes of God, we should remember that they are only the modifications of one comprehensive moral perfection, his goodness. "God is love." Justice as an attribute of the moral Governour, is that disposition of mind which is directed to secure the general good by supporting the authority of his law. Justice in a more general and popular sense may be said to consist in rendering to every one his due. This definition however like other abstract definitions, needs explanation; for we should differ widely concerning the nature of this attribute, and predicate very diverse things concerning it, unless we can be well agreed in some

common principles of determining, *what is every one's due.*

That may be said to be due to one on the principles of benevolence, as distinguished from principles of justice, which the public interest renders fit and proper to be given him, but to which he possesses no personal claim. Thus the general good of a nation, renders it fit, that peculiar rewards be conferred on subjects who have performed some distinguished service for the state, as for example, on the commander of an army for achieving a brilliant victory, or an artizan for some useful improvement in mechanism. This principle respects service rendered in obedience to the requirements of law, or where no requirements of law exist. In the former case the reward is given as an expression of the ruler's approbation of the obedience rendered, and as an inducement to others to render similar acts of obedience. In the latter case where no law required the conduct rewarded, the reward is given as an expression of the ruler's approbation of conduct which is beneficial to the public. The merit of the conduct performed in each case is the merit of congruity or fitness, and has, as we shall hereafter show, no relation to justice, as an attribute of the moral governor.

That also may be said to be due to one which is the subject of promise, or for which an equivalent has been received.

That also may be said to be one's due, which he can claim on the ground of personal desert and as a matter of right. Thus every obedient subject has a right to the protection of life, liberty and property.—This is denominated the merit of con-dignity, or the merit of desert.

That is one's due as a subject of law which is necessary to support the authority of law. The public good indispensably requires that the law be supported in full authority. That therefore which is necessary for this purpose is due to every subject.

In reference to the three last prin-

ciples of determining what is every one's due, justice has been divided into *commutative*, *distributive*, and *general* justice. It is not to be inferred however, that these terms, designate three different sorts of justice, or so many distinct attributes. The terms are used to distinguish the different operations of justice toward its objects according to their different relations. Thus justice requires the communication of good in fulfilment of promises and covenants; and in certain cases by rendering an equivalent for what has been received.—This is called *commutative* justice. As God however can receive nothing from creatures but his own, *commutative* justice can pertain to his character in the relation which he sustains to creatures, only in reference to the fulfilment of promises and covenants. Justice as an attribute of the moral governor, can respect nothing but the enactment and enforcement of equitable laws, or the equitable administration of a moral government.

Justice as an attribute of the moral governor, respects the personal desert of each subject viewed in his individual capacity. No injustice must be done to any subject. Justice therefore requires that each subject be rewarded according to his positive merit, and that no subject be punished beyond his demerit. If the subject who has broken the law be considered merely in his individual character and not in his relation to the public interests of the kingdom, justice would not require his punishment; because justice viewing him as an individual is concerned only to see that as such, no injustice be done him; and exemption from punishment would to him as an individual be no injustice. At the same time justice to him as an individual admits of his punishment and that in a degree corresponding to his ill-desert; because in this case no injustice would be done him. God then is just toward the subjects of his kingdom viewed in their individual capacity, so long as he withholds no good from any which they positively

merit and punishes none beyond their ill-desert. This operation of justice is called *distributive* justice.

Justice in the moral governor also respects men as they are related to his kingdom, and requires the support of the authority of his law as the means of general good. There can be no moral kingdom without a law to regulate the conduct of its subjects; there can be no law without sanctions; and there can be no authority in a law whose sanctions are not fully enforced. Were God then to fail to enforce the sanctions of his law, he would neglect the general good, and would do injustice, it being obviously unjust in any ruler thus to sacrifice the general good to any inferior interest. Justice therefore in relation to the subjects of the divine kingdom, is no other than a particular regard to the general good, as that is involved in the support of the authority of the divine law; and imperiously demands that the sanctions of that law be fully enforced. This operation of justice is called *general* justice.

We shall now attempt to exhibit the harmony of these different operations of justice as an attribute of the moral governor, with general benevolence, and also with each other, by shewing what justice *admits* and what it *demands*.

Justice *admits* that higher rewards be given to obedient subjects, than they can claim on the ground of personal merit. It may be necessary to the public good, that God present more powerful motives to obedience, or that he express a higher degree of approbation of obedience, than he would by measuring rewards exactly according to the positive merits of the obedient. In such a case, general benevolence, not general justice, demands that the higher rewards be given. General justice is concerned only to see the authority of the law supported, and extra rewards can never be demanded for this purpose. The law is in full force, and binding on every subject without such re-

wards. Separate all such rewards from the law and still no complaint could be made that the law did not as a law amply provide for the general good. General justice therefore *admits* that higher rewards be given than can on the principles of distributive justice be claimed by the subject. At the same time distributive justice does not forbid the conferring of such rewards. It only forbids in the case of the obedient that they be rewarded less than they personally deserve. To confer a reward on the obedient, therefore which is beyond their positive merit, or to withhold such a reward is not inconsistent with the justice of God.

The justice of God *demands*, first, that no more evil be inflicted, and that no less good be conferred on any subject than he deserves. This remark is too obvious to need any illustration. The justice of God *demands*, secondly, that he inflict no less punishment on any than what is necessary to support the authority of his law. Were the punishment inflicted less in degree or duration than that which is necessary to support the authority of the divine law, God would sacrifice the public good to some private or individual interest, and would be obviously unjust. Whether the degree of the sinner's punishment be equal to or less than his ill-desert, no principle of distributive justice is violated; he cannot complain for he suffers *no more* than he deserves to suffer. Indeed, he must in all cases deserve to suffer as much as the general good of the divine kingdom requires that he should suffer; for his ill-desert is always great in proportion to the magnitude of those interests which his conduct tends to destroy. Of course as his conduct tends to prostrate the authority of the divine law, he deserves to suffer as much and as long as shall be necessary to prevent that injury. And what he thus deserves, the general justice of God requires to be inflicted.

The sinner's ill-desert may be considered as consisting in the tendency

of his conduct to prostrate the authority of the divine law. His conduct has this tendency in two respects.

First, as a failure to honour the law. As clothed with the authority of God, and as the appointed means of happiness to his kingdom, the divine law claims the obedience of its subjects. The law cannot be honoured by the subject unless he openly recognise the authority of God and testify to the excellence of the law, by obedience. Every transgressor therefore fails to honour the law, by refusing to shew that the law is worthy to be obeyed. The whole weight of God's authority over him, and the high excellence of the divine law as the means of immeasurable good to the divine kingdom are thus contemptuously slighted. While he thus refuses to render homage to the supreme Legislator and to furnish his testimony to the excellence of the supreme law of the moral universe, he also refuses to produce that positive happiness which would result from obedience. He is therefore chargeable with withholding from the law all that lustre and glory, which would accrue to it from the perfect blessedness of God's kingdom as the appropriate effect of obedience. The same act of rebellion against God is direct hostility to the purposes of infinite benevolence, and unrestrained would defeat them all. Who then can measure its desolations? Survey in thought the kingdom of God laid waste by the ravages of sin, and in these ruins, in the contempt of God's authority, of the excellence of his law and of the happiness of his kingdom, may be seen how far the sinner is from bringing that revenue of honour to the divine law which it claims. Here lies one part of his ill-desert.

Secondly, the same act of disobedience tends to produce the impression that the law may be violated with impunity. The unequivocal declaration of every violation of the divine law, is, either that the law is without a penalty, or that its penalty is unworthy of regard; a declaration which

unless counteracted, is adequate to impart the hope of impunity to every subject who should meditate transgression. Should one transgressor of the divine law then be suffered to escape its curse, the principle on which rests the certainty of punishment would be relinquished. The law would be divested of its penalty, and no direct counteracting influence remain to prevent rebellion throughout the dominions of God.

The sinner then deserves punishment to prevent the prostration of the divine law. He deserves it, as the indispensable means of supporting the throne of a reigning God, and of securing all that good which is involved in the fact, that the infinite Being, reigns to display through the medium of his law, his capacity to bless his kingdom. If therefore by inflicting suffering on the sinner, the authority of the divine law can be supported, he deserves all the suffering which is necessary for this purpose, and the justice of God demands that he bear it.

The question now arises on what principles must punishment be inflicted, to answer the great purpose of preventing the prostration of the divine law? We answer, first, that degree of punishment must be inflicted which shall be seen to be a full expression of the sinner's ill-desert. Were God to inflict but a trifling punishment for so great an evil as sin, there would be no evidence furnished of his due abhorrence of the malignity of sin. The holiness of his nature which renders the punishment of sin inevitable, would be concealed from the eye of every subject, and the great principle of righteous retribution, that of rendering to the wicked according to their deeds, would be abandoned. Besides, if the severity of punishment may be less than the ill-desert of the sinner, it may be diminished to any extent; punishment *may be* wholly laid aside, and *this* principle once admitted, no proof could be furnished that God would punish sin as sin at all. Nothing would appear to shew

that punishment was not inflicted as a matter of caprice, and as the dictate of despotic sovereignty, that it was not diminished or increased in to subserve the designs of lawless favouritism, or to gratify a fitful malevolence. That punishment therefore may support the authority of the divine law, it must be inflicted according to the sinner's ill-desert, and that this principle may appear in the divine administration, the degree of punishment must be a full expression of the sinner's ill-desert.

Secondly, punishment to support the authority of the divine law must be inflicted so long as ill-desert continues. Punishment can never cancel sin. The termination of punishment, therefore, would be a virtual exemption from punishment. The sinner would be set at liberty with all his guilt upon him, and while deserving as truly as ever the punishment of his sins. The principle therefore of punishing sin as sin would be abandoned, the same reason for punishment existing in the character of the sinner for the continuance as for the commencement of punishment. The very end therefore of punishment, which was to prove that God would support his law by punishing sin as sin, would be defeated.

Further, should punishment cease, no proof would be furnished either by obedience or punishment, that the law has any demands on the subject. What has become of the demand for perfect obedience? This demand has not been satisfied by obedience. Punishment cannot render the sufferer innocent. The demand therefore for perfect obedience is visibly renounced, and of course the authority of the law prostrated by a limited punishment. No sanctions whatever pertain to the law. Neither the authority of God, nor the law itself on account of its excellence, has been honoured by obedience; and yet the sinner is exempted from every mark of the divine displeasure. He goes free from punishment, the subject of the same ill-desert as had he not been punished. It thus becomes apparent, that the

moral Governour does not maintain the high and holy demands of his law for the obedience of the subject; and that he does not punish sin as sin. Let this fact be proclaimed, let it be seen in the actual emancipation of rebel angels from the prison of retribution, and who does not see that the law of God is made void, and the empire of righteousness subverted.

Admitting, however, that a limited punishment would be sufficient to counteract the impression, that *sin might go unpunished*, and that so far, ill-desert may be cancelled by a limited punishment, still the sinner's ill-desert for having refused to honour the law by obedience would remain; ill-desert which as truly tends to prostrate the authority of the law, as that which is now supposed to be cancelled. Let the sinner be exempted from punishment at any assignable period, and all that weight of sanction which the law derives from the authority of God, from the excellence of the law itself, and from the evil tendency of transgression, is gone. No evidence of its existence remains. The law, instead of demanding that honour and glory which would accrue to it from the perfect obedience of the subject as the only condition of withholding punishment, has abandoned this demand. Thus the declaration is decisively made, that the law may be spoiled of its honours by the subject, and that, with the entire acquiescence of the Lawgiver himself. But this cannot be, and the authority of the law be supported; in other words, the authority of the law cannot be supported by a limited punishment. To support the authority of the divine law, therefore, it must be seen that the principle of punishing sin as sin is maintained, and that the moral Governour will never suspend the strokes of vengeance, until his violated law shall receive its highest honours. Unless this truth be conspicuous throughout his kingdom, a principle would obtain, that would invest his revealed purpose to punish with

an air of doubt and uncertainty. But when the unchangeable Jehovah is seen to adopt the principle of inflicting punishment so long as ill-desert is found in the subjects of his moral administration, then he appears the holy, just, and inflexible avenger of sin, his law is sustained in full authority, and every hope of impunity is blasted by the combined glories of the Godhead.

To support the authority of the divine law, *the justice of God demands that the sinner be punished, that the degree of punishment be a full expression of the sinner's ill-desert, and that punishment be continued so long as ill-desert continues.*

The way is now prepared to resume the consideration of the atonement and to examine the several points of discussion which the subject involves.

The first topic presented, is *the end to be answered by an atonement.*—

Dr. G's views of this important end, will be learned from the following extracts.

“What end did the death of Christ answer as an atoning sacrifice? Precisely the same, as respects the support of law, that would have been answered by our punishment. The atonement we have seen, was a cover for sin,—was adapted so to bury sin from view that it should not be punished. It therefore came exactly in the room of punishment, and ought to answer the same end. When it had done that, it had removed the necessity of punishment, and constituted a complete cover for sin.”—p. 22.

“The support of law therefore comprehended all other ends, and may be put for the whole. The same end is answered by the execution of the penalty, only in a higher degree. Without the execution it would have been the same as though no penalty had existed. The law would have lost its authority, the reins would have been thrown upon the neck of every passion, anarchy, discord, and misery would have ravaged the abodes of being, and all the happiness which is bottomed on holy order, and all the discoveries of God which are made in a holy and vigorous moral government, would have been lost. This unbounded mischief would have followed a prostration of the authority of the law: that prostration would have followed a proclamation of impunity to trans-

gression: and this proclamation would have been implied in a neglect to execute the penalty. The only way to prevent this infinite mischief, was to proclaim and prove that transgressors should be punished. In this single declaration and proof the whole antidote lay.”—p. 23.

“In examining this subject it is necessary to keep immoveably before the eye the end which an atonement was intended to answer in the government of God. It was the same that would have been answered by punishment.”—p. 28.

In these remarks, if we mistake not, the author has fallen into an error which misleads him through the whole investigation of the nature of the atonement. Representing the atonement as supporting the authority of the law and as removing the necessity of punishment, by simply answering the end of punishment, and by coming in the room of punishment, he makes no distinction between the manner in which punishment and that in which atonement supports the authority of law.

The punishment of the damned fully supports the authority of the law. This it does by having the stamp of *eternity* upon it. This punishment therefore can never remove the necessity of punishment. At each revolving period in eternity, justice will still demand punishment.—Whether therefore this necessity be removed or not, depends not on the fact that the authority of the law is supported, but, as we shall see *on the manner* in which that authority is supported.

How then does an atonement remove this necessity of punishment? The sinner is now to be treated as one who has never sinned. The law therefore must be as fully honoured as it would have been had he perfectly obeyed it; the justice of God, to maintain its claims, must find no more necessity for punishment, than were the sinner perfectly holy. Were God to remit punishment, and leave the whole necessity of it, which law and justice create still the same, no more proof would be furnished that God would punish sin than what would

exist, without an atonement. It may be said and justly said, that an atonement which should leave the necessity of punishment the same, would not be an atonement. But this only shews that an atonement to be an atonement must effect something which punishment never can effect. Punishment supports the law and satisfies justice as a continued grant to a continued claim. It shows that God has not abandoned the claim that his law shall be fully honoured. An atonement must extend farther in its influence, it must reach the very principles on which the claims of justice rest, and remove the necessity of those continued claims, in other words remove, the whole necessity of punishment which justice creates.— Until this be done, until the law be so honoured and magnified that it shall be equally venerable, efficacious and likely to be obeyed as had it never been violated, until some expedient be devised and adopted effectually to secure that highest dignity to the law which justice was pledged to secure as the condition of the divine favour, then and not till then *can* justice consent to the pardon of the sinner.

The atonement then to remove the necessity of punishment must fully sustain and vindicate the claims of divine justice in the grant of pardon to the sinner. Justice demands that a degree of penal suffering be inflicted on the sinner, that shall be a full expression of his ill-desert; and also, that punishment be continued so long as his ill-desert continues. If these two claims can be completely sustained and vindicated, justice *can* consent to remission, if they are not completely sustained and vindicated, justice *must* demand punishment. To sustain these claims, an expedient must be adopted which shall present an expression of the sinner's ill-desert in sufferings endured, and which shall also, so cancel his ill-desert, that justice demanding the highest honour of the law, *can* consent to his pardon.

The end to be answered by an atonement is now, we think distinctly before us; viz. *an atonement must so sustain the principles on which the claims of divine justice rest, that justice CAN consent to the justification of the sinner.*

What other end an atonement could answer, or for what other it could be necessary we are utterly unable to discover. If it did not remove the necessity of punishment, created by divine justice, and thus do more than punishment could have done, it could not be an atonement. If it did remove this necessity, it opened the way so far as law and justice are concerned for the conferring of any favour on the guilty. It could do no more. It could not bind the arm of justice. The sinner is equally ill-deserving with as without an atonement; and although justice *can* consent to his pardon, yet if any interests of the divine kingdom demand his punishment, justice is at liberty to do its work. Atonement could not change the divine nature, and render God more benevolent; it could not render him more disposed to shew kindness to the guilty and the wretched than he would be without an atonement. It could only render the favour of God to the guilty consistent with one modification of his benevolence, that is, consistent with his benevolence as pledged in the form of justice to secure the great ends of his moral government, by supporting his law. When it had done this, it had of necessity removed every obstacle created by justice to the eternal life, as well as to the pardon of the sinner. The end therefore and the only end which an atonement could answer, was to sustain the great principles of God's justice, or to shew that God is just in justifying the ungodly. It was, in the language which his spirit dictated, "for a proof of his own righteousness in the remission of sins which were before committed through the forbearance of God; for a proof also of his righteousness in the pres-

ent time, in order that he may be just when justifying him who is of the faith of Jesus.*

While on this part of the discussion we would carefully guard against a common misapprehension. Some distinguished theologians represent the general justice of God, as the same thing with his general benevolence, and the atonement of Christ as rendering pardon and life consistent with general justice. Not improbably to this representation is to be traced the charge so often preferred against the doctrine of an universal atonement, that it leads to the doctrine of universal salvation. And, if it be true that an atonement has rendered it consistent with the purposes of general benevolence to save all men, all will undoubtedly be saved. But there is a broad and visible distinction between the general benevolence and the general justice of God. General benevolence respects that which is *on the whole* desirable, or which is desirable to be done when all things are considered in reference to the doing of it. General justice respects simply one indispensable means of good, viz. the support of the authority of God's law; and when it is said that atonement satisfies divine justice, the meaning is, that atonement secures one particular end of benevolence; it supports the authority of the divine law, which is indispensable to the general good of the divine kingdom. But because God through an atonement can pardon the sinner consistently with *one* end of benevolence, it does not follow that he can pardon all sinners, or even one sinner, consistently with *all* the ends of benevolence. When the general benevolence of God surveys the interests of his kingdom, it sees that there is *one* end which the pardon of sinners will not defeat; it will not prostrate his law. General justice as one modification of benevolence was only pledged to secure that *one* end; and that end is secured by an atone-

ment. But whether the pardon of sinners, even of one sinner, will defeat or promote the immense designs of general benevolence, is undecided by an atonement. Of this, God is the Judge. Man, to decide who or how many will be saved, must know other facts beside that an atonement is made. He must scan with omniscient survey the full and comprehensive designs of infinite wisdom and goodness, and be able to see how many of our guilty race, can consistently with these designs, be delivered from their deserved doom. The authority of the divine law in the salvation of our guilty world, would be as effectually supported by the atonement of Christ, as by the endless punishment of every offender. Fully to support the authority of the law however, is not actually to secure the obedience of any of its subjects. To secure this end another influence may be necessary, even that which can be furnished only by the final perdition of millions of our guilty race. Their perdition, though an act of justice to them, is not as the means of supporting the divine law, the indispensable demand of justice. It is an act of justice to the guilty, dictated by benevolence toward the good of the whole; it is justice to some as the means of perpetuating the obedience and joys of God's holy kingdom.—Thus the moral universe enjoys the most perfect and lasting happiness, under the mild effulgence and all-pervading energies of infinite benevolence, and the glories of the saved, and the miseries of the damned, alike proclaim that "God is love."

Dr. G. next leads us to the consideration of the "matter of the atonement," having still the same object in view, viz. to establish the distinction between the obedience and the atonement of Christ. After remarking that the whole use of an atonement was to shew that God is determined to support the authority of his law, by punishing sin, he proceeds,

"What was that by which the Protector of the law furnished the same practi-

* Rom. iii. 25, 26. Vid. Macknight in Loc and Wardlaw, p. 214.

cal proof of his resolution to execute the penalty, that he would have given by punishment itself? My general answer is, it was *humiliation imposed and sufferings inflicted by his own authority and hand on his beloved Son*. What could so naturally show that God would inflict evil for sin, as the actual infliction of evil on account of sin? as the tokens of wrath discharged against the Son of his love standing avowedly in the place of sinners?

"The law as it stood related to transgressors, had two parts, precept and penalty. As it stood related to those who had not sinned, it had also a reward for obedience, and I add, for nothing but obedience. Accordingly the task devolved on him who took the sinner's place, consisted of two parts; obedience which stood related to the precept, and sufferings which came in the room of the penalty. By obedience also, and nothing but obedience, he obtained a reward in which his people were to share. In accordance with all this our salvation consists of two parts; a release from the penalty, and a participation of the positive good involved in Christ's reward. Here then in one line were the penalty of the law, the sufferings of Christ which came in its room, and our release from the penalty as the consequence. Here also in another line, were the precept of the law with the reward of obedience annexed, the obedience of Christ with the reward which followed, and our admission to the positive good involved in that reward. All this appears plain and natural. The sufferings and obedience of Christ, two parts inseparable in fact but separable in influence, constituted one whole. That was followed by another whole, to wit, our salvation, consisting of two parts, equally inseparable in fact but separable in contemplation, viz. deliverance from hell and elevation to heaven. Now what I assert is, that the appropriate influence of one part of the first whole stood related to one part of the second whole, and that the appropriate influence of the other part of the first whole stood related to the other part of the second whole; in plain language, that the sufferings of Christ came in the room of our sufferings, and his merit in the room of our merit; that by one he lifted us from hell to earth, by the other he raised us from earth to heaven."—pp. 28, 29.

The author adds that,

"The obedience of Christ was necessary to atonement in the two following respects.

"1. To render him, in typical language, a Lamb *without blemish*. In plain language, his general obedience, (and of course his general subjection to law,) was necessary to set him forth as the *beloved*

Son, and thus to render his sufferings sufficiently expressive of God's inflexible resolution to punish sin. He must be infinitely dear to God to give his sufferings this full expression."—p. 30.

"2. The act of the Priest in presenting the Victim must necessarily be an act of obedience. The Father must command him to die, or the stroke would not have come from his own hand. But the infliction must be made by the very Magistrate who is thereby to show that he will punish others. At his command the Victim must be bound, at his word the stroke must be given, and under his authority and hand the Substitute must die. But in no way could the stroke be inflicted by divine authority, but either by being obediently submitted to, or by being forced by main strength upon one struggling against the authority; in which latter case the sufferings would have been personally deserved, and could no more have atoned than the pains of the damned. The necessity of the command appears in another point of view. The satisfaction must be rendered to One holding the authority of the Godhead, and of course by One not on the throne, and therefore, as the throne of God must reign over all beneath it, by One under law: and when he was under law, he had no right to die uncommanded."—pp. 31, 32.

"Had it not been obedience, the sufferings would have been of no validity, for they would not have been exacted by the supreme Magistrate from the beloved Son, nor have been any evidence that he would punish others. The whole effect of the act was to bring the sufferings into a proper relation to God by drawing out the stroke from his own hand."—p. 33.

These views of the author coincide with our own, so far as they respect the influence of Christ's obedience to the law under which man was placed, and the necessity of his obedience, that the stroke might come from the Father's hand. The chief point on which Dr. G. insists in the chapter before us, is, that the obedience of Christ did not enter into the "matter of the atonement." To this opinion we cannot subscribe.

"The matter of the atonement" says Dr. G. "is the thing that satisfied." Whether therefore the obedience of Christ enter into the matter of the atonement, depends simply on the question, did that obedience in any way satisfy divine justice, or was

it necessary to support the authority of the divine law. We have attempted to shew that the justice of God demands that the sinner be punished so long as his ill-desert remains, or until the law receives its highest honours, and that this is necessary to support the full authority of the law. The law cannot, (and this Dr. G. admits) receive its highest honours from the sufferings of the surety. The demand of justice, therefore, that the law should be fully honoured, or the sinner be punished eternally, is not satisfied merely by the sufferings of the surety. The sinner is exempted from punishment, while the law demands a perfect obedience as the condition of his exemption, and no obedience is rendered. This demand of law therefore is obviously disregarded.

We fully agree with the author, that "a great and glorious testimony was to be sent forth to the universe by means of the atonement but that testimony was to come from the Father." On this principle however he excludes the obedience of Christ wholly from the matter of the atonement. On this principle we suppose obedience to be necessary to an atonement. The testimony to be sent forth was that God would support the full authority of his law in the remission of sin. If the view we have taken of the demands of law and justice be correct, it was no more possible for God to support the authority of his law, and to satisfy the claims of justice without requiring obedience in the surety as a substitution for the sinner's failure to obey, than without exacting sufferings as the expression of his ill-desert; the one being necessary, that God might shew that he would never remit punishment until amends were made for the sinner's failure to honour the law by obedience; the other, that he might make that expression of the sinners ill-desert in sufferings endured, which was necessary to prove that sin should be punished with suffering.

To the enquiry then what consti-

tuted the atonement for sin, we answer, *the obedient consent of the well beloved son of God, to humiliation sufferings and death.* This was an act of submission to the Father's will, an act of homage to his supreme authority, which sanctions that will and enthrones that authority as effectually as the obedience of a world would have done. The sinless obedience to the divine law of every child of Adam, would no more have evinced the righteous supremacy of God, and the excellence of his law than did the voluntary submission of the Son of God, to the will of the Father in the work of redemption. Thus the work of Christ as obedience, so far satisfied the justice of God, that in one respect it could consent to the pardon of the sinner.

But the same justice demands that there be a full expression of the sinner's ill-desert in sufferings endured. And now we see the Father sending the Son into this world, and throwing the veil of flesh over his glory; we see the cup of trembling put into his hand and the sword of justice awake against the man that is his fellow; we see the blood of the everlasting covenant poured out and this scene of agony and death, till the victim cries, "it is finished," bows his head and gives up the ghost. A rebel world in the flames of hell, could furnish no more decisive expression of the wrath of God against sin, than did the sufferings and death of his beloved Son.

Thus by Christ's obedience, sufferings and death, the justice of God is maintained in all its inflexibility and splendour. Did that justice demand obedience as the means of honouring the divine law in the remission of sin, that claim is sustained by the voluntary homage and obedience of him who was the brightness of the Father's glory. Did that justice demand a full expression of the sinner's ill-desert in sufferings endured, that claim is also sustained in the agonies and death of the Son of God.

In his scriptural argument, the au-

thor has wholly overlooked what appears to us to be the only legitimate conclusion from those texts, which ascribe both parts of salvation to the death, and those which ascribe both parts of salvation to the obedience of Christ. The fact that "the obedience" and "death" of Christ are thus interchangeably used by the inspired writers, is in our estimation, decisive, that either includes the other, and that their influence on both parts of our salvation is so blended, that we cannot separate the influence of one from that of the other without a departure from scriptural accuracy in our representation. On what principle then, does the author separate the influence of Christ's death from that of his obedience, and consider one as the ground of our deliverance from hell, and the other as the ground of our elevation to heaven? "The solution," he tells us, "is that the death of Christ includes both atonement and merit." Why then does he adopt a theory which ascribes but one influence to the death of Christ? Indeed, if it be strictly true, as Dr. G. supposes, that the death of Christ has but one influence, how is the apostle justified in ascribing to it two influences? The same remarks apply to those passages of scripture which ascribe both parts of our salvation to the obedience of Christ. For if the obedience of Christ has no influence to deliver from the curse, how is the apostle justified in ascribing our deliverance to that obedience?

The author proceeds to shew—

"From the scriptures that the thing which was offered *for sin*, and which *came in the room of punishment*, and which *laid the foundation for pardon*, was no other than suffering."—p. 49.

He cites several texts which shew that Christ's sufferings are the ground of pardon. It is obvious that texts of this class decide nothing on the point whether obedience enter into the matter of the atonement, unless they prove that these sufferings were not themselves acts of obedience.

We shall not farther tax the patience of our readers on this point, by an examination of the passages which convince us that the obedience of Christ enters into the matter of the atonement. Dr. G. has made a demand, however, which we feel obliged to notice. "Shew me," says he, "a text which affirms that either his (Christ's) general or final obedience, *as a testimony* helped to render *sin pardonable*." His demand we think is rather too extensive. For if we can shew that the obedience of Christ is exhibited in the scriptures as at all the ground of pardon, we have established the position that obedience enters into the matter of the atonement. For this purpose, we allege a text cited by Dr. G. with his explanation of one of its important terms. "Then said he, lo I come to do thy will, O God:—by the which will we are sanctified, ('separated,' says Dr. G. 'from the curse of the law, pardoned,') through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." But how are we pardoned by Christ's doing the will of God, or by his obedience, unless that obedience helps "to render sin pardonable"? Vid. Matt. xx. 28. Jno. x. 15—18. Rom. v. 19. 2 Cor. v. 21. Gal. iii. 13, 14. Gal. iv. 4, 5. Phil. ii. 6—8. Tit. ii. 14. Heb. v. 6, 10, and vii. 27. With these texts before us, we can find no warrant to ascribe distinct and separate influences to the obedience and to the death of Christ. The scriptures blend them, and ascribe to their combined influence pardon, justification, and eternal life.

Our author's view of the obedience of Christ, next claims our consideration. He says:

"Christ was 'under law,' and his reward was a legal one; but the law never promised a recompense to any thing but obedience. No claim could be created on the Father but by a promise from him, and no promise appears but to One under law, for services rendered in obedience to the command of his King. One of the duties enjoined upon him was to lay down his life. So far as that was a duty it was obedience, and no further than it was a duty was it entitled to a reward. That

act was of greater merit than other acts of obedience, because it involved greater self-denial; but the sufferings bore no other relation to the reward than as being the highest test of obedience. Christ was rewarded for his obedience "unto death," not for his sufferings viewed as *uncommanded*; not therefore for sufferings in themselves considered. What claim could uncommanded sufferings have to a reward? Should a creature in any part of the universe inflict pain on himself which God had never required, who would be bound to recompense him? There is no such duty of supererogation in the kingdom of God. But if the sufferings of the Son, only as commanded, could be entitled to a reward, it was the obedience of surrendering himself to die, and not the pain as such, which created the claim."—pp. 56, 57.

After specifying the two influences of obedience which went to qualify the sufferings of the surety, and to bring them into a necessary relation to God, he observes:

"All the other influences of obedience which are to be named were influences of *merit*, and produced their effects only by obtaining a reward. Before proceeding further, therefore, let us stop and fix on some marks by which a thing may be known to appertain to Christ's reward. I lay down the following principles. All that Christ did as one of the contracting Parties was to obey even "unto death." Whatever that obedience and death, stripped of every extrinsic circumstance, could accomplish, was done by himself; the rest was done by the Father, and so far as it expressed approbation of Christ, or honoured him, or directly gratified his benevolence, was a part of his reward. Every effect then which followed his obedience and death, beyond what their own necessary influence could accomplish, and was honourable and gratifying to him, appertained to his reward. What then did the necessary influence of his obedience and death effect? It rendered every thing which followed *consistent with the honour of the law*, and created a *covenant claim* on the Father for the whole. It went no further. The *bringing to pass* of all that followed was the Father's part, and was done in pursuance of his covenant engagements; which engagements were suspended on Christ's obedience "unto death." All therefore which actually followed was Christ's stipulated reward."—pp. 60, 61.

In accordance with these views, Dr. G. also maintains, that it was an act of justice to reward Christ;—that

he had a right to claim reward at the hands of justice. Vid. pp. 159 et al.

From the opinion that Christ's obedience was strictly a *legal* obedience, we entirely dissent; and to represent him as having a claim on justice, we think is speaking too loosely, and in a manner tending greatly to mislead.

Christ was under no obligation to render obedience, except the obligation of promise. Should a foreign Prince by treaty come under obligation to our government to afford aid in the redemption of captive subjects, his services could with no propriety be denominated legal obedience. Service which merely fulfils a promise, is essentially different from that which fulfils obligation to a law. The one is doing the will of another by way of stipulation; the other is fulfilling an obligation which exists whether there be a stipulation or not. In the one case, there is no right to require the service except as the fulfilment of a promise; in the other, there is a right to command the service without a promise. As the general and final obedience of Christ was simply in fulfilment of covenant stipulations, his obedience was not strictly a legal obedience, nor his reward a legal reward.

There are but two principles on which a reward can be given to legal obedience; one is that the obedience deserves the reward by the merit of condignity; the other that the reward be given to express the ruler's approbation of obedience as the fulfilment of obligation, and thus to induce others to obey the same law in expectation of the same or a similar reward. None will pretend that Christ is rewarded on the latter principle. To suppose that he is rewarded on the former, i. e. for the merit of condignity, appears to us to be subversive of the moral government of God. Such merit would give the surety a claim on distributive justice. As therefore his reward is the salvation of the elect, the moral governor cannot inflict the penalty of his law on all who

have transgressed it, and maintain unsullied the attribute of his justice.— But surely Christ does not prevent the execution of the penalty by interposing a paramount claim on the distributive justice of the moral governour. If such a claim can be found in the universe the moral governour is reduced to the humbling alternative of withholding the curse from rebels, or of being unjust to another claimant. In this case, justice in its exercise toward the guilty is not restricted by designs of mercy but shackled and bound by the peremptory demands of right and equity. The moral governour can no longer treat all according to their deserts; an imperfection which blots from the assemblage of his glories, the very attribute whose splendours circle and guard the eternal throne.

According to this view of the nature and influence of Christ's obedience, we are at a loss to see in the salvation of sinners, that fulness of the grace of God, which the scriptures unfold. Whatever degree of grace there may be on the part of the Son, in creating and urging his claim on distributive justice in behalf of sinners, the reward itself is obtained from the Father in answer to this claim on justice. But to confer blessings on one, as an act of distributive justice to another, is a faint display of grace, compared with the riches of the grace of God, which the gospel reveals. In short, in this view of the subject, we can account for the song to the lamb, but not for the song to him that sitteth on the throne.

We readily admit that God is in justice bound to fulfil his promises; but it is *commutative* justice that binds in such cases. Justice, as an attribute of the moral Governour, regulating his dispensations according to personal desert, has nothing to do with the fulfilment of promises. To say that God is bound to fulfil a promise, is a very different thing from saying he is bound on the principles of distributive justice to reward an act of legal obedience. And in the pre-

sent case this difference has a most important bearing both on the moral government of God, and on the dispensations of his grace. Contemplating the obligation of the Father to the Son simply as the obligation of a sovereign promise, we can see how that obligation is consistent with the justice of the moral Governour in the destruction of every sinner, and with the richest grace in pardon. But if the surety possess that personal merit which has a claim on distributive justice, then we confess ourselves wholly unable to see how the substitute is not possessed of a claim which effectually annihilates the claim of justice against the sinner, and renders "the immutable claim of justice unjust."

It is evident that Dr. G. wholly overlooked the distinction between commutative and distributive justice, or he could not have used the language which he has used. Thus he insists that Christ has a claim on justice to a reward, a claim founded on the merit of his legal obedience, "merit with which distributive justice is concerned," and yet that "no claim could be created on the Father, but by a promise from him." But if the claim of Christ to a reward rests on the ground of legal obedience as meritorious, in other words, if he has a claim on distributive justice to a reward, then his claim cannot rest simply on the ground of promise. If his claim rest simply on the ground of promise, it cannot rest at all on the ground of legal obedience as meritorious, i. e. as deserving a reward from distributive justice. A mere promise cannot create a claim on distributive justice. If there be no merit of condignity, without a promise of reward, the promise cannot create such merit. All the obligation to bestow a reward in such a case, is the obligation of promise. It is therefore an obvious absurdity, to say that no claim can be created on the Father, but by a promise from him, and yet to consider the claim as a claim on distributive justice.

Although the author in some in-

stances, by the language which he uses, leads us to suppose that he considers the claim of Christ as a claim on distributive justice yet in others, he plainly speaks of justice only in the commutative sense. He says,

"After the Father had constituted him the Saviour of the world, and had publicly promised to accept his sufferings in behalf of believers, and had secretly covenanted to communicate faith to the elect, he owed it to him to do as he had said."—p. 163.

It would seem from this remark, that Dr. G. considers the claim of Christ as resting wholly on the stipulations of covenant, and that independently of these stipulations, the surety could have no claim to a reward. "A price," says he "has no claim till it is accepted." Whether the thing proffered be an equivalent or not, there is no obligation on that account, to accept it. The prerogative of sovereignty in the holder of the captives, is not invaded by the offer of the redeemer. If therefore, that which is offered be accepted, and if a reward be promised in return, still the obligation to give the reward, results wholly from the promise. It may be true that the reward is given in view of services rendered. But it is given not as a reward for legal obedience, but in return for services, which, aside from the stipulations of covenant, are required by no law. It is given for precisely the same reasons for which it was promised. What then is there in the services rendered for which the Father in his sovereignty, promised to reward the work of the Son? We answer, simply, its atoning influence. And here we come to the only remaining principle on which a moral government can render a reward for services done, viz. as an expression of his approbation of conduct which has an important influence on the general good of his kingdom. It was not as we have seen, the merit of condignity in Christ's obedience, that obtained his reward; it was not the merit of congruity considered as pertaining to a legal act; it was the merit of congruity, in relation to the purpo-

ses of benevolence. And what was there in the work of Christ to subserve the purposes of benevolence, except its atoning influence? And what beside to induce the Father to reward him? The moral excellence of the act in itself considered, could not procure his reward. The general good of the divine kingdom must be consulted, before a reward could be promised, for any service however excellent in itself. Besides, no moral excellence could pertain to Christ's consent to die, apart from the atoning efficacy of his death. Nothing else could have authorised the act. The work of Christ, could have no influence to render the Father more willing to bless the guilty, than he would have been without it, provided the obstacle interposed by justice had been removed. It must therefore have been that and that only in the work of Christ which removed this obstacle, that procured his reward. There was no other end to be answered by his interposition with respect to any interests of the divine kingdom, except as those interests were involved in supporting the authority of the law. This end being answered, no reason can be found in the work of Christ, why Paul should be saved and not Judas. Whether one or both, or if one, which should be saved, was a question not remotely affected by what Christ had done. He had done that on account of which both might be saved consistently with justice. Every other question therefore concerning the salvation of these men must have been decided by other reasons than those furnished by the work of Christ.—While therefore, the work of Christ rendered the salvation of men consistent with one purpose of the divine benevolence, viz. the support of law, it could have no influence on any other purposes of that benevolence. As the only influence therefore of the work of Christ, is an atoning influence, it was solely in reference to that influence, so far as the nature of his work is concerned, that the Father promised him a reward.

The scriptural argument of the author to prove that Christ is rewarded for his obedience as a legal act, in distinction from being rewarded for an atoning influence, seems to be equally defective with that already noticed to prove that sufferings alone constitute the atonement. The very text on which we should place the most unshaken reliance to prove that it is the atoning influence of Christ for which he is rewarded, are the texts which Dr. G. quotes to prove that he is rewarded for obedience as distinguished from atonement. We shall cite one of the passages and refer to others, leaving the reader to decide

which opinion they support. "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied. By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many, for he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great and he shall divide the spoil with the strong, because he hath poured out his soul unto death."*

(To be concluded.)

* Isa. liii, 10—12.—Ps. ii, 6—8 & lxxxix, 3—37—Vid also, Phil. ii. 7—11.

Literary and Philosophical Intelligence.

Proposals are issued by John Sayre, New-York, for publishing by subscription The life of the late Rev. Samuel J. Mills, written by the Rev. Gardiner Spring, D. D. The profits of the work will be devoted to missionary purposes.

"The proprietors of Rees' Cyclopaedia, have great pleasure in announcing to their subscribers, that the work will be completed in one part more, which is in a state of considerable forwardness. This part will comprise the Editor's preface, wherein will be specified the names of his principal coadjutors; the remainder of the title pages and the plates; a digested and explanatory catalogue of the plates, and an alphabetical index of all the subjects which are illustrated by the engravings, with references in every case to the particular plate and figure wherein the subject is represented."

The Legislature of Massachusetts have refused to grant the petition of the Trustees of Williams' College, for the removal of that institution to Northampton.

The number of pupils that have been received into the New-York Institution for the instruction of the deaf and dumb, is sixty-seven. Of these, eleven

have been withdrawn; thirty-five board in the asylum, and twenty-one live with their parents, or friends.—The monies received amount to \$12,402 20 cts. and the expenditure to \$2,999 12, leaving a balance of \$9,403 63 cts.

The Trustees of the Bank for savings in the city of New-York, have made their first Report, by which it appears that the bank was opened for deposits on the 3d of July 1819, and from that day until the 23d of December, inclusive, there has been received from 1,527 depositors the sum of \$153,478 31. Of this sum, \$6,606 have been drawn out by depositors, and forty six have closed their accounts.—The total number of deposits was 2443.

A Savings' Bank has been established at New South Wales.

It is stated that 'the number of gas lights already in use in the metropolis of London amounts to upwards of 51,000. The total length of mains in the streets through which the gas is conveyed from the gas light manufactories into the houses now measures 238 miles.'

The settlements in New South

Wales and Van Dieman's Land have increased with such rapidity that by a census taken in November it appears that the population amounted to 25,050 souls, being an increase in one year of nearly 5000 inhabitants. These colonists send horses to Batavia, cattle and salted meat to the Isle of France, flower to the Cape of Good Hope, and oil, seal skins and wool to the Northern country.

Suicides in Paris.—'The number of suicides committed and attempted in Paris and its environs in the four months of January, February, March, and April, amounted to 124. Of these persons 33 were women; 64 of them were single, and 60 had been married. The greater number destroyed life by

the use of fire arms, the vapour of charcoal, or by drowning; 46 resorted to the last method. This period of 1819, compared with the same period of 1818, offers an excess of 41 suicides.

By the end of June the number amounted to 199, of which 137 were committed by men, and 62 by women; 102 of these were married, and 97 were unmarried. These have been arranged in a sort of scale according to the causes: thus, for love 17; illness, distaste of life, insanity, domestic trouble, 65; bad conduct, gaming, lottery, 28; misery, poverty, deranged affairs, 47; fear of reproaches and punishment, 6; unknown motives, 38; in the whole 199, of which 53 were unsuccessful attempts, and 146 were completed.

List of New Publications.

THEOLOGY.

A sermon preached at the Dedication of the House of Worship, lately erected for the use of the first Church in Dedham; by Daniel Dana, D. D.

A letter to the Rev. Adoniram Judson, relative to the 'Formal and Solemn Reprimand.' To which is added a letter to the third Church in Plymouth, Mass. on the subject of Baptism; by the Rev. Adoniram Judson, Jr. Missionary at Rangoon.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A Review of the Trade and Commerce of New-York, from 1815 to the

present time, with an Inquiry into the cause of the present distress and the means of obviating it; by an Observer. New-York.

The Crisis, or Thoughts on the Missouri Question, Nos. I and II. New-Haven.

A Compendious System of Geography; being a description of the Earth and of the manners, customs &c. of the various nations who inhabit it; to which is added plain directions for constructing maps, illustrated by plates, with an Atlas; by Jacob Willetts. Poughkeepsie.

Religious Intelligence.

Extracts from the Journal of the Mission at Elliot.

July 16, 1819.—Have lately been favored with a plentiful supply of rain. This is a most favorable providence. It has not only revived the drooping fields, but has caused an uncommon rise of waters; so that the boat on the way with various supplies for the mission, and for this neighborhood, can reach us without difficulty. Our flour is nearly exhausted, and as for corn,

there is none to be bought within 150 miles. Our family consists of about 40 persons.

20.—An Indian came from the road, and brought us a packet of letters, Panoplists, and Newspapers. It is impossible to describe the interest we feel on these occasions. After being entirely excluded from the world a number of weeks, we are in a moment transported to our native land, to Africa, India, and China: have a full view of the noble plans of piety which adorn the pre-

sent age, and hold sweet converse with the wisest, the purest, and the best of men.

At our meeting for business, *resolved*, that we hold a meeting on the Sabbath, after public exercises, for the benefit of our hired men and children, and such of the brethren and sisters as can conveniently attend.

23.—Replanted some Irish potatoes which we raised this season, in hopes of another crop. Our corn, sweet potatoes, beans, peas, &c. in all 20 or 25 acres, look promising.

25.—Considered the duty of self-denial in those who would be the followers of Christ, particularly with reference to our peculiar situation. The thoughts were suggested by our Lord's expostulation to his disciples. Matt. xvi. 24.

26.—This morning have been busy in cutting a part of the vines from our sweet potatoes, and setting them out in rows. From these vines, thus transplanted, we expect to raise small potatoes, called slips, for next year's seed. This is economical, and they are said to be better for seed, than those raised directly from the potatoes.

28.—About ten minutes before 9, P. M. perceived a flash of light, and looking towards the north east, saw a fiery ball descending with great rapidity in a westerly direction, at an angle of 60 or 65 degrees with the horizon. In appearance it was not more than four or five inches in diameter. We listened for a minute, or more, to hear the report, but heard none. We entered into a conversation, and in about four or five minutes, heard a report resembling that of a distant cannon. If the report proceeded from the meteor, as unquestionably it did, it must have been 50 or 60 miles distant, and very large. The day had been hot and dry, as also several preceding; and the evening was clear, except a few hazy clouds.

We are beginning to reap the fruits of our agricultural labors. Among other vegetables, we have very fine Irish potatoes, raised from seed which came from New-Hampshire, by way of New-Orleans. We have also fine muskmelons: our watermelons were planted late, and are not yet ripe.

30.—About noon, a half breed called at our house, with a letter from our brethren, Fisk and Pride, whom we have long expected. We understand

by the messenger, that they are within a day's journey of the station. One of their horses had failed, and they requested that we would come to their assistance. The brethren, L. S. and A. V. Williams, immediately set off with horses to meet them.

August 1.—Last night the rain poured down in torrents, and the wind blew almost a tempest. All the creeks, and many of the small branches, are full, and there is no passing, except by swimming. We have great anxiety for our brethren, who had probably nothing but their blankets to shelter them last night from the storm. Brother Kingsbury and an Indian boy set off to meet them, and carry them some refreshment. At four o'clock in the afternoon the brethren all arrived in safety; though much worn down with fatigue. Brother K. met them about seven miles from the mission. They had left their waggons and most of their baggage in the woods, on account of the high water. They were obliged to stand up most of the night, thoroughly drenched with rain.

The arrival of these dear brethren, and the letters and intelligence they have brought, have greatly refreshed our spirits.

2.—We have cause for gratitude that the brethren arrived yesterday. Last night we had another powerful rain. The creeks are higher than they have been before this year.

3.—Three of the brethren set off to bring in the waggons, which had been left in the woods, about nine miles from the mission house. They found every article safe, and returned with them before night.

We learn this morning that the boat we had expected, is yet at a considerable distance. One of the hands died after they entered the Yazoo; others are sick. The master was obliged to leave the boat, and come up the river for help. This is another trial of our faith and patience. We have not flour for more than one baking, and no dry corn. But green corn is beginning to be plenty in the neighborhood, and we have some excellent potatoes. So that by the care of a kind Providence, we shall still be provided for.

4.—Sent four hands to help bring up the boat. Brother Pride was called to attend one of our neighbors sick of a bilious fever. We are happy that it is

in our power to extend the blessings of our mission to the bodies, as well as the souls of this people.

Considered in our meeting for business, that, in respect to house room, we could accommodate fifty scholars the ensuing winter; also, that fifty dollars a year be considered a compensation for those parents, who are disposed to pay for the board of their children.

7.—Brother Kingsbury set out to attend a general council of the Nation, to be held at a place called the Upper French Camp, about sixty miles distant. We expect business will be transacted highly important to the interests of the mission, as well as to the nation.

Sabbath, 2.—Held a meeting as usual. In the afternoon held a second meeting, about three miles distant, which was well attended.

15.—Brother Kingsbury returned, but not in season to attend public worship. He was unexpectedly detained by a heavy shower and tempest. It blew almost a hurricane. The sound of the wind could be heard more than two miles.

During this scene, brother K. had an opportunity of witnessing the practice of the Indians on these occasions. The man, at whose house he took shelter, was a half breed chief, of good natural sense, and some information. As soon as they heard the wind, apprehensive what the event might be, the father and son took down their guns, deliberately loaded them, and waited the approach of the tempest. In a few moments the scene was sublime and awful. The crashing of the trees, and the darkening aspect of the clouds, were suited to lead the mind to adore, in awful silence, that Power, who rides on the whirlwind, and directs the storm. At this instant the Indians discharged their guns. It is a belief, which they have probably derived from the whites, that a musket ball discharged into a hurricane will break its force. The wind passed by without doing any other damage than breaking the tops of dry trees, and some branches from the green ones.

The following is extracted from brother K.'s journal, during his absence to attend the sitting of the council.

"I arrived at the council ground on the morning of the 9th, the day appointed for commencing the talk. As a number of the chiefs had not arriv-

ed, they did not proceed to business. In the evening, several kegs of whiskey were brought by Indians, to sell out to those assembled on the occasion. Capt. Folsom, and several other half breeds, immediately went to those who owned it, and stated the bad effects of selling whiskey to the Indians, while they were attending council. They were easily persuaded to deliver it up, and it was put under lock and key, until the talk should be ended.

"10. No business done to-day. The chiefs from the six towns have not yet arrived. Report says, they found whiskey on the way, and will not come to the council till it is gone. Those present are perfectly civil. There has been no disturbance throughout the whole encampment; and in fact, they have no quarrels at any time, except when under the influence of whiskey.

"I have conversed with a number of the chiefs concerning the school, and the importance of making some provision for the support of the scholars. They manifested an interest on the subject, but I fear nothing decisive will be done at this meeting. By consent of the Agent, I notified them, that I wished to give them a short talk, when they are ready to hear it. They informed me that they would listen to it when the other chiefs arrived.

"11th.—About eight o'clock in the morning, Col. McKee, the U. S. Agent, called at the house where I lodged, to inform me, that a white man was found dead in the camp this morning; and requested that I would attend the funeral, as soon as a grave could be prepared. The deceased was in health yesterday, ate a hearty supper last night, and went to sleep as usual. Two white men slept by his side, who found him a lifeless corpse in the morning. How uncertain is human life! "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for thou knowest not what a day may bring forth."

"At eleven attended the funeral.—Many of the chiefs and Indians were present. After a short address and prayer, to which they gave profound attention, the body, wrapped in a blanket, was interred with decent solemnity.

"The council, which had been delayed on account of the funeral, convened at 12 o'clock, and gave notice that they were ready to hear what I had to say to them.

"Col. McKee very kindly introduced me to the head chiefs, and made a few remarks very favorable to the school.

"The place for holding the council was a square area of 39 feet on each side, over which poles were laid supported by forks, and covered over with bushes, to screen those under it from the sun. The chiefs were seated on the ground. After I began my address, a heavy shower of rain came on, and the covering of bushes proved but a comfortless shelter in the storm. Col. McKee, myself, and two or three others, were defended by umbrellas; but the chiefs were thoroughly drenched; yet they listened to all that was said with great attention. The rain soon subsided, and after Col. McKee had read two letters to the council, they adjourned.

"12.—After the council had convened this morning, Capt. Folsom, a half breed chief of some information, and who possesses great influence, addressed the council in a very animated manner, for a considerable time, on the importance of schools, and several other subjects. A subscription was immediately opened, and between 80 and 90 cows and calves, and more than \$1300 in money were subscribed for the benefit of the school at Elliot. It is not probable that the whole subscription will be collected."

"16.—At our meeting for business, resolved, that brother Jewell go to collect the stock lately subscribed for the benefit of this school; also, that we hire three blacks, one man and two women, of Col. McKee, for one year, if we can obtain them.

23.—Brother Jewell went with two half breeds hired for the purpose, to collect the stock lately subscribed.

28.—Brother A. V. Williams was taken ill last evening. While attending family worship, he experienced a difficulty of respiration, and was obliged to close abruptly. Some medicine was given him, and he retired to bed. In the night his wife was awaked by his groans of distress. His brother and Dr. Pride were called in, and after bathing, and administering some gentle sudorifics, he obtained a partial relief. He is still quite indisposed, so that he has not left his room to-day.

29.—Brother W. was so ill last night as to require constant watching. He has become so helpless as to be unable to

turn himself in bed, and to require two men to move him. His disease is considered to be the acute rheumatism, attended with a burning fever. We are sensible that all our dependence must be on God; but it is a satisfaction to have a physician in our family to prescribe such remedies as a kind Providence has furnished for the relief of suffering man.

30.—Brother and sister Kanouse left us this morning, to return to their friends in New-Jersey. It was painful to part with this brother and sister, particularly under our present circumstances. They have been faithful laborers, and have greatly forwarded the work of this establishment. They came with the expectation of returning at the close of one year. We had indulged the hope, that, considering the circumstances of the mission, and our great need of help, they would have continued until winter. But their friends were unwilling that they should continue longer.

We do believe, that if the children of God could witness the perishing condition of these heathen, they would be willing to give up their children for so glorious a work, as the bringing of them out of darkness into the light of the Gospel.

Sept. 3.—Brother W. is more comfortable this morning. Towards noon had two ague fits, followed by fever and profuse sweat. We fondly hoped his disease would change to a regular intermittent; but our hopes were soon dissipated by the return of increased pain and burning fever.

5.—The symptoms of our brother have become truly alarming. The pains, which had been alternately in his breast, back, and limbs, have become fixed in his bowels and stomach. We have relinquished all hopes of recovery. Distressing hiccoughs, and deep hollow groans, admonish us of his approaching dissolution.

About ten in the evening, the family were called together to take their final leave of our beloved brother, who was supposed to be dying. But the time of his release had not arrived. His distress is extreme, and it would almost melt a heart of stone, to hear his doleful moans. But his soul rests sweetly on Jesus, and he appears perfectly resigned to the will of his heavenly Father.

6.—Life is still prolonged, but we are

not permitted to indulge any hope of recovery. The most powerful medicines have ceased to have any effect. At ten in the evening we were again called together, to witness the dying agonies of our dear friend and brother. The struggle was severe. About a quarter past eleven he was sweetly released from the sorrows and sufferings of this mortal life. "Blessed are the dead, who die in the Lord."

7.—About four P. M. we followed the remains of our departed fellow-laborer to the silent tomb.

How mysterious are the ways of Providence. At a time when we seem most to need assistance, one of our small number is removed by death. Few have been the days which we have spent together; but they have been pleasant. We have been united in the best and most exalted labors, which bound our hearts together by the tenderest ties.

Brother Aries V. Williams had cheerfully devoted himself to the cause of Christ among the heathen. Having set his face to the work, he cheerfully endured the burdens and hardships which fell to his lot. While on a dying bed, he was asked, if he regretted that he had come to this distant land, to labor for the cause of Christ. "O no," he replied with emphasis, "I only regret that I have done no more for him."—Through his whole sickness he was calm and resigned.

Being asked about the state of his soul, he replied, "I cannot say I have so lively exercises as I once had; but I know Jesus is all-sufficient, in him I trust, and I feel that I can lean my head upon his breast, and breathe my life out sweetly there." This last sentiment was often repeated, during the last days of his sickness.

He often showed an ardent desire to speak to us, but distress and weakness of body prevented. To his deeply afflicted wife, and to his brothers and sisters in the mission, he said, "Let your light shine;—live above the world; be fervent in spirit." To Mrs. P. the Choctaw woman, who we hope has savingly embraced the Gospel, he said, as she entered the room, "Can I not call you a dear sister in Christ? Jesus is my friend, I hope he will be yours."

It may be truly said of him, that he was waiting the coming of his Lord. At times he would say, "O my dear Saviour, what wait I for? Why dost

thou so long delay thy coming?" Thus with a lively hope he resigned himself to the arms of his Saviour, and we trust, has gone to receive the reward of those who continue faithful unto the end. His memory will long be precious to us, and long shall we bewail the loss we have sustained. May the Lord of the harvest raise up others, of a similar spirit, to come and occupy the place vacant by his death.

16.—Brother Jewell returned with 54 cows and calves, and two steers, collected of those subscribed for the benefit of this school. The others we shall get next spring. A black woman came with brother Jewell, who was sent by the Agent to assist us for a while.

Extracts from the Journal of the Mission at Batticotta.

Nov. 6, 1818.—Christian David, with his wife and two youngest daughters, came to Batticotta this morning. Mr. D. preached to the usual number of hearers, which is a little more than two hundred when he preaches. I am not able to collect so many to hear me. The scholars from two or three of my schools are included in the above mentioned number. Mrs. David will spend a few days here, to visit and converse with some of the neighbouring women, and induce them, if possible, to come here on the Sabbath, and also to send their daughters to be educated. Mr. D. will leave his two children above mentioned with us for the present. He wishes them to receive an English education. They eat at our table, will be considered as a part of our family, and not as belonging to the charity school. An elder daughter, who lived with us for some time, has now gone to reside with brother and sister Poor at Tillipally. They are all amiable children, and it is of great importance that they should receive a good education, as Mr. D. hopes that they may eventually be employed to teach schools of their own sex among the heathen. They dress in the English mode. Their father does the same; but their mother still continues her native dress. The dress of the higher class of natives is very convenient for this climate. It is also modest and very neat, and has the great advantage of being comparatively cheap. It greatly increases the expense of a native, to dress after the English fashion.

Sabbath, Nov. 3.—The sacrament of the Lord's supper was administered at Batticotta. A few native women attended the meeting. Brother Poor was present.

16.—A few weeks since, two boys came to us in a manner worthy of notice. The parents of the first belong to Pondicherry, on the Coromandel coast. They came to Jaffna to trade. While here, their son was enticed away by a man who was going to Trincomale to trade. There he was left. He however got back to Jaffna; but during his absence his parents had returned to Pondicherry in search of him. The boy had no one in Jaffna to take care of him. He wandered about some time from place to place, in search of food, and of a place to reside. At last a person, who was acquainted with my plan of taking boys to support saw him, and brought him to me. Under these circumstances, I could not refuse to take him, although his parents are not here to make an agreement with me. His appearance is now good; though when he first came here he appeared half starved, and was almost naked. He is about thirteen or fourteen years of age—very pleasant and amiable—attentive to his business—and makes good progress in study. He also speaks the Tamul language very correctly. I should, before this time, have written to his father, to inform him of his son's residence with us; but the boy does not know the name of his father, as he was called by the name of his trade, and not by his proper name. I hope soon, however, to be able to write to him.

The other boy is about twelve years of age, and much like the first in his manners. His parents are dead, and he has no other near relations to take care of him. He has for some time past lived with a *Pandareem*, (a kind of privileged beggar,) who, he says, was very unkind to him. When he left the *Pandareem*, who lives about four miles from this place, he wandered about several days, seeking some one who would set him to work, and give him his rice. Some person to whom he made known his situation, told him that I was in the habit of taking poor boys, and giving them food, clothes, and learning. He came to me, and begged very hard to be taken. I consented to let him stay till I could learn farther particulars concerning

him. He has since conducted himself well, and appears to be a fine boy. He was able to read and write Tamul when he came, and he now applies to his studies with great diligence. I cannot but hope, that both these boys have been sent to me by a kind Providence for the good of their own souls, and the souls of others.

December 1.—This day experienced a violent storm. The rain and wind have been very heavy all day. But what is most remarkable, is the fall of the thermometer. Yesterday it stood at 76 deg. the common height for the rainy season. This morning it had fallen to 70 deg. and shortly after it fell to 69 deg. and when exposed some time to the strong wind, it fell to 67 deg. which is lower by several degrees than I have seen it in Ceylon. I am informed, that it has not fallen so low for many years before. In such storms the natives, for want of clothing and warm houses, suffer very considerably. During the hottest weather in April, I have not seen the thermometer higher than 90 deg. in the shade.

16.—This morning the *manigar*, (the head-man of Batticotta,) one bramhun, and several other respectable men, called on me. After inquiring respecting the epidemic, I made many observations to them concerning the uncertainty of life, and the great importance of being prepared for death. This almost insensibly led to much conversation, relative to various points of the christian and heathen religions. Some of the people were disposed to cavil; others to hear attentively. The bramhun was much inclined to cavilling. He manifested much pride, and much ignorance. It is difficult to say which predominated. After I had made some observations respecting heaven and hell, the bramhun asked very significantly, "how do you know these things? Did any person ever come from the other world to tell you?" Yes, I replied, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, came from heaven into this world. He knew all things, and has told us all things, which it is necessary for us to know respecting them. He has told us the truth, and if you will candidly examine the Scriptures, you will see that they are a revelation from God.

After the rest of the people had gone, I asked the *manigar* to stay and hear me further on the subject, and then conversed with him more than an hour

longer. He appeared really desirous to be informed, and exhibited more candor than almost any native with whom I have ever spoken on the subject of religion. He frankly confessed, that *in the heathen religion there is no Saviour*; and no way in which sin can be pardoned, without rendering an equivalent; that if a man sins, he must be punished equal to the desert of his sins. His ideas, however, of the demerit of sin, are very defective. He asked whether real Christians will not be punished for their sins after death, before they are made happy? On being answered in the negative, he asked how it was consistent with the justice of God to forgive sin? I told him, that the justice of God would not permit him to forgive sin without a satisfaction, and then proceeded to show him how justice and mercy have met together, in the atonement made by Christ—how all the ends of God's law are answered by this, as much as they would be by the eternal punishment of the sinner. I dwelt a long time upon this point, as of fundamental importance. He then made inquiries respecting the nature, extent, and desert of sin. On these subjects I find the heathens are lamentably ignorant. I gave him, as well as I was able, a scriptural view of the subject, showed him the strictness of God's law, and the nature of sins of omission as well as those of commission. Of this distinction he appeared wholly ignorant. I then shewed him how the bad motives of wicked men taint all their apparently good actions, particularly when they do good merely to be seen of men. He pleaded guilty on this subject, and confessed that he had often performed actions which he supposed very good, from no other motive than to be seen and praised by his fellow men. All these subjects appeared new to him, and he expressed himself highly pleased with the information he had obtained. How much sincerity there is in his professions, time will show. I urged him to attend to these things immediately, and to call often and converse with me about them. May God bless his word to the salvation of this soul.

Sabbath, 27.—Went again this afternoon to the same place at which I preached last Sabbath. The people, according to their promise, assembled in greater numbers than before. The

principal subject, which I endeavoured to illustrate and enforce on their minds, was the greatness of the love of God, in giving his Son to die for sinners. Alluding to the epidemic, which has made its appearance, and is now raging with violence in some parts of the district, I asked the parents who were present, whether any of them would be willing to give *one* of their children to be killed, provided, by that means they might save a thousand people in Batticotta from death? They all answered, "No." Would you give one of your children to die in order to save all the inhabitants of Ceylon? "No," was the universal answer. Behold then, said I, the wonderful love of God. He gave his only begotten, his well beloved Son to die for his enemies. "God so loved the world," &c. They acknowledged that it was very great and wonderful love, and that it was their duty to love and serve God.

Jan. 1, 1819.—This being the first day of the year, I assembled all my schools together, to hold an examination, and also to preach to them. As some of the schools are at a considerable distance, many of the small boys did not come. One hundred and eighty attended. I found they had generally made good proficiency in their studies. Watts' minor catechisms, the Lord's prayer, creed, ten commandments, and Christ's sermon on the mount, were all repeated by many of the boys, and parts of them by all. I did not examine them in their other studies.

In addition to the boys, about fifty men attended public worship, making in all (including our household) an audience of about two hundred and fifty, which is the largest I have ever had in Batticotta.

After public worship, in order to try how strong were the prejudices of the boys and their parents, I invited them to take dinner with my boys. As this was the first time I had given an invitation, I did not expect that many would accept it. Only nineteen boys out of the whole number were willing to eat; the rest all positively refused. Some of the school masters told me, that the parents had heard how the boys at Tillipally had eaten with their school on Christmas day, and had given the boys a strict charge before they left home in the morning, not to eat at my house. Their prejudices are very strong on this subject. To those boys

who would not take their dinner I distributed plantains. They have no objections to eating raw fruit, even though it is given them by Christians.

TOUR TO CHOULE.

Narrative of a Tour to Choule, near Bombay, for the purpose of establishing Schools, distributing Books, and preaching the Gospel, by Rev. GORDON HALL, American Missionary.

October 23, 1812.—About 10 o'clock I embarked from Bombay in a *pate-mar*, for Choule. The boat belonged to that place, and was manned with about ten Mussulmauns, and had on board about the same number of passengers, who also were Mussulmauns. I was accompanied by the Jew, Samuel Yasoph, who has been the teacher of our Jewish school in Bombay, ever since its establishment. Having had experience of his ability as a school teacher, and he being a native of Choule, it was thought best that he should go with me; and that he should be employed in teaching a school there, should it finally be thought expedient to begin schools in that region.

No sooner had I gone on board, than the crew and my fellow passengers were inquisitive to know who I was, what was my profession, and what my object. And, as their custom is, these inquiries were directed not to me, but to the native, the Jew, who was with me. Being informed that I was a *padre*, (the common word in and about this country, for *priest*,) and that my object was to teach a certain religion, to distribute books, and to establish charity schools,—we very naturally fell into conversation on these subjects.

I conversed a little; but perceiving the approach of that severe sea-sickness, which I always experience when I go on the water, I proposed to my Jewish companion, who was not thus affected, to read one of the tracts to the people. He readily complied, and began to read the first tract of the Scripture history. A part of the people sat around him to hear.

As he read, I occasionally made remarks, and they made various observations, showing that they had some little knowledge of Moses, and his account of the creation; of Adam and Eve, of Cain and Abel, of Noah and the flood; of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob

David, Solomon, and other characters, and events recorded in the Scriptures. They readily assented to what they had heard, and seemed highly grateful, until we came to the reflection on the fall of man and his redemption through a Saviour's blood, and then, like all the votaries of the Arabian impostor, they started at the name "Son of God," and, as taught by their arch deceiver, they were ready to turn away with contempt. But I desired them to listen to the explanation, which, they did, until both reader and hearers, in addition to a partial sea-sickness, were almost overcome by the excessive heat of a vertical sun, shedding his scorching rays upon our open boat. The exercise was therefore discontinued, and each one made himself as comfortable as he could.

In about five hours from the time of sailing, we landed at what is by Europeans called Choule; but what the natives uniformly call Rawadunda, about three miles to the east of which is the town properly called Choule, and which is not in the English territory, but in the dominions of Angrea, King of Calaba.

Here, in a small compass, are six or eight towns belonging to the English, and in these towns there may be 30,000 inhabitants, who, excepting about 200 Roman Catholics, and 50 families of Jews, and a few Mohammedans, are all Hindoos. This place has had a succession of masters, and has experienced great changes. Soon after the Portuguese came to this country, they here commenced a settlement. The fort which they built in front of the town of Rawadunda, was one and a half mile in circumference, with lofty walls and numerous towers. Not a single human being now inhabits this spacious fortification. It is all one uniform cocoanut grove, spreading a wide melancholy shade over the mouldering ruins of temples, monasteries, and other edifices, both public and private,—once the superb mansions of a Christian people; but now merely the abode of loathsome vermin. Within two miles of the same spot, the ruins of Mohammedan fortifications, temples, seraglios, and monuments in their burying grounds, show, that here, at some former period, another empire must have risen up, flourished, and then vanished away.

It is now about six months since this

territory passed from the Mahratta sovereign into the hands of the English.

Immediately on my landing, I walked nearly a mile to the further side of the town, and there took up my quarters with a Jewish family. I was so exhausted with sea-sickness, heat and fatigue, as to be quite unfit for any further exertions. After sitting a while, however, I concluded to take a walk into the fort.

On my way I called at the tent of an English officer, who was residing there a short time, for the purpose of taking a survey of the fort and district. He received me kindly; and, after taking a walk with him among the ruins of the fort, I returned and dined with him, and at about 9 o'clock again reached my lodgings. This closed the labours of the day.

29.—In the morning I arose quite refreshed with the repose of the night, and encouraged with the hope of doing something towards diffusing a knowledge of the Saviour among this numerous heathen people, who I suppose were never before visited by a Protestant missionary.

Before breakfast I walked through the town to the sea shore. On my way, near the beach, I passed two Hindoo temples, which bore the marks of indigence and neglect. In front of one of these temples I stopped, and briefly addressed a number of people, and called upon them to renounce their idols, to worship God their Maker, to repent of their sins, and to believe in Christ their Redeemer.

Returned to breakfast. My arrival having been published the preceding evening, and some few books having been distributed, many people came early for books to my lodgings. I read and spoke to a large number, and gave them books at their own earnest request.

After breakfast, accompanied by two Jews, I walked through Derwajabehore, Kaup, and Taronda, three towns lying on the sea board to the north of the fort. In these towns I stopped and distributed some books, and addressed such of the people as I found disengaged.

On our way back we turned eastward, entered the territory of the native prince, Angrea, and visited a large Hindoo temple about two miles east of the fort. The principal temple is a

large, costly, but very ancient building, surrounded by a number of inferior ones. It stands in a solitary place, and around it are but a very few poor native huts. This temple is far superior to all the other temples in this region. Still, but very few persons are attached to it, and it is manifestly a place of but little resort. Near the temple I sat down under the shade of a tree. Eight or ten persons came and sat down with me. An aged Hindoo, with expressions of much kindness, brought me the milk and meat of a cocoa-nut with some sugar, and desired me to refresh myself. This I was very glad to do, for it was now about the middle of the day, and I had walked four or five miles in a very hot sun. I improved the opportunity by addressing the people on the subject of salvation. I gave them a few books, which I desired them to read repeatedly, and to consider seriously; assuring them that if they would follow the directions contained in those books, they would obtain the pardon of their sins, the favor of God, and the happiness of heaven. I then took leave of them, and returned to my quarters.

After resting two or three hours, I started at half past three o'clock in company with three Jews, intending to visit some temples about four miles to the east, in Angrea's territory. On my way, I passed by those mouldering monuments of Mohammedan faith and power, before mentioned. The first village I passed through is called Kolwer, and contains about 75 families, and a large Mussulmaun burying-ground. But here I neither met with any of the inhabitants, who are principally fishermen, nor distributed any books.

I then passed on to the town properly called Choule, which I was told contained 1500 or 2000 inhabitants. They seemed very friendly, and appeared to be familiarly acquainted with my Jewish companion, our schoolmaster. Through him I learned, that there was no school in the place, but that there was a man who would be glad to teach one, and that it would be pleasing to the people to have one. It was now late in the day. I made some short stops, spoke to a few of the people, and gave them books.

I next turned to the north, towards the temples on the brow of a mountain, which I had hoped to visit. But after

walking a while longer, I found they were so distant, and so difficult of access, that I could not well reach them, and so relinquished the object.

I then bent my course towards my lodgings, and taking a more inland road, I travelled most of the way in Angrea's dominions, passed by several forsaken temples, both Hindoo and Mohammedan, and one guard house of his Hindoo Majesty. Distributing a few books on the way, without much intercourse with the few people I saw on the road, I reached my lodgings about sunset, and was not a little fatigued with my walks of not less than 15 miles in the day.

(To be concluded.)

SUMMARY.

A missionary society has been formed in Hunter, Greens County, N. Y. There are 54 members. It is a place 'where three years ago, the footsteps of the missionary were never heard.'

The Catholic Congregational Church of Bristol, R. I. have resolved that in January and July, annually, a contribution be made to spread the Gospel among the destitute; or for the education of pious youth for the ministry, as circumstances shall render expedient. The contribution in January amounted to \$25 80 cts.

A mariner's Church has been commenced at Charleston, S. C.

The funds of the Baptist Association in Charleston, S. C. for the education of poor and pious youth for the ministry amount to \$8,355 54 cts. and their funds for missionary purposes, to \$792 75 cts.

The Moravians, or the Unitas Fratrum, have upwards of 30 missionary stations, and employ 55 missionaries, and it is supposed that 28,000 persons have been converted from paganism to christianity. The annual expenditure of the society is about £8000 sterling. The committee to whom is entrusted the care of Missions have published a Report from which we give the following extracts:—

"A Society for the Furtherance of the Gospel, among the Heathen, was instituted by the Brethren in London, as early as the year 1741, for more effectual co-operation with, and assistance of the said department or committee, in caring for those Missionaries who might pass through London to their several posts. This society was, after some interruption in their meetings, renewed in 1766, and took the whole charge of the Mission on the Coast of Labrador upon themselves: besides continuing to assist the other Missions, as much as lies in their power, especially those in the British dominions. As no regular communication is kept up with the

Coast of Labrador by Government, a small vessel is employed to convey the necessities of life to the Missionaries once a year; and here we cannot help observing with thanks to God, that fifty years have now elapsed, during which, by his gracious preservation, no disaster has befallen the vessel, so as to interrupt a regular annual communication: though, on account of the ice, and many sunken rocks, the navigation between the settlements is of the most dangerous kind. A fourth settlement is in contemplation to the north of Okkak.

"In Amsterdam a Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was established by the Brethren in 1746; and renewed in 1793, at Zeist near Utrecht. This Society took particular charge of the Mission at the Cape of Good Hope, but the late troubles in Holland have rendered them unable to lend much assistance for the present. The Brethren in North America established a Society for propagating the Gospel among the Heathen, in the year 1787, which was incorporated by the state of Pennsylvania, and has been active in providing for the Missions among the Indians. Schools are established in all the Brethren's settlements among free heathen, as in Greenland, Labrador, among the Indians in North America, and among the Hottentots. Though in the West India Islands this is not generally practicable, the children being not under the immediate controul of the parents; yet, by permission of some planters, attention has been paid to their instruction in reading. For the use of the schools, spelling-books and a catechism, or Summary of Christian Doctrine, are printed in the Greenland, Esquimaux, Delaware, Aruwack, and Creol languages; hymn-books in the Creol, Greenland, Esquimaux, and Delaware languages; and, by the liberality of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles, were printed for the use of the Brethren's Missions in Labrador; a harmony of the Four Evangelists, in use in the Brethren's Church, is also printed in the Greenland and Esquimaux languages; and other parts of the Scriptures, translated into different heathen tongues, but yet only in MSS. are in constant use."

The Church Missionary Society has eight Missions, above forty missionary stations, upwards of one hundred christian teachers, and in the schools connected with missionary stations, more than six thousand children besides many adult scholars. In the conclusion of their report the committee observe:—

"The Civil and the Military servants of the Crown, throughout its Foreign possessions, and of the East-India Company in its territories, are freely offering their labor and their influence to aid the benevolent designs of Christians. Asia, in her northern regions, opens to Russian charity;

and, in her southern, to the beneficence and justice of this country.

"The 'Cyrus' of our day, the truly great Alexander, is placing himself at the head of Christian enterprize, as a *Nursing Father* of the Church, and counts it his highest honour, to place his crown at the foot of that Throne, to which he offers unwearied prayers for a blessing on the labours of Christians in their attempts to convert the world.

"Ancient christian churches are reviving from their slumbers. The glory of the Lord will be reflected by them on the surrounding Heathen. Their dignified representatives are coming over to us in person to beg at our hands, as a boon, the means of causing their churches to shine out with splendour before the world.

"A spirit of discussion is rising among Mohammedans. The now blessed Henry Martyn has awakened in Persia dissatisfaction with their own Creed. Hindoo Deists are shaking to the foundation the superstitions of their country. Heathens themselves are liberally aiding in the diffusion of Christian knowledge. Every where the press is demanded for the circulation of divine truth. An eagerness after knowledge, and a restless anxiety for something wiser and better than what they now have, are manifesting themselves in every quarter."

Sunday Schools are establishing in France under the patronage of the Reformed Churches.

By the direction of the Emperor of Russia, a monument has been erected at Cherson to the memory of Howard.

REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

On the 16th ult. seventy-six persons were received into the church in the east

parish of Boscawen, N. H.—Of these thirty were baptised.

In Milbury, Mass. there is a revival of religion.

In Plainfield, the attention of many has been excited to their spiritual concerns, and a number are rejoicing in hope.

The Rev. William F. Sauter, one of the Moravian missionaries in Antigua, writes, under the date of Nov. 8, 1819, thus:—"The work of grace among the blacks in this island continues to prosper, and seems to spread more and more. From the 3d to the 10th ult. we spoke with 529 baptized persons, and candidates for the Lord's Supper; and from the 10th to the 17th, with 905 communicants. On the last mentioned day, 25 persons were admitted to the communion for the first time, and five, who had been excluded, were re-admitted. From the 17th to the 24th, we conversed with 2203 new applicants and candidates for holy baptism. Of this number, 21 were propounded for baptism, 50 for reception into the congregation, 24 for re-admission, and 104 as new candidates for baptism.

DONATIONS TO RELIGIOUS AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.

The donations to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, in the month of December, amounts to \$1,983 51.

The Treasurer of the American Education Society acknowledges the receipt of \$835 in the month of January.

The Treasurer of the American Bible Society acknowledges the receipt of \$1,575 62, in the month of January. The number of Bibles issued in that month, was 2857; and of Testaments, 2081.

Ordinations and Installations.

Nov. 30th.—The Rev. ALVAN BOND, was ordained pastor of the congregational church and society in Sturbridge, Mass. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Mills, of Sutton.

Dec. 29th. The Rev. SAMUEL W. BRACE, was ordained by the Presbytery of Geneva, and installed pastor of the church and society of Phelps, Ontario county, N. Y. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Porter, of Ovid, N. Y.

Jan. 19th.—The Rev. CHARLES FREEMAN, was ordained pastor of the congregational church and society in Limerick. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Payson of Portland.

Jan. 19th.—The Rev. DAVID DICKINSON, was installed pastor of the congregational church and society in Columbia. Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Bassett, of Hebron.

Jan. 26th.—The Rev. DANIEL A. CLARK, was installed pastor of the First church and society in Amherst, Mass. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Porter, of Farmington, Conn.

Feb. 2nd. The Rev. CALVIN FOOT, was ordained pastor of the congregational church and society in Southwick, Mass. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Ely, of Monson Mass.

View of Public Affairs.

UNITED STATES.

The Missouri question is still agitated in the national councils, though a final decision may have been taken before this goes into the hands of our readers. In the Senate, the vote on a restrictive amendment, offered by Mr. Roberts, was, yeas 16, nays 27.—When the question was taken on concurring in the amendment, reported by the judiciary committee, to unite the Maine and Missouri bills in one, there were for uniting the bills 23, against it 21. All the senators from the free states, with the exception of those from Illinois, and of Mr. Taylor, from Indiana, voted in the negative. On the question, however, whether the bill should be engrossed and read a third time, Mr. Hunter, of R. I. Mr. Parrott, of N. H. and the Senators from Delaware, voted in the affirmative, and Mr. Taylor, of Indiana, in the negative.—It is confidently expected, notwithstanding the friends of slavery triumph in the Senate, that in the House of Representatives they will be in a minority.

SOUTH AMERICA.

In South America, signal success has attended the arms of the patriots. Lima has been taken by the independents, under Gen. St. Martin, and Quito has declared itself independent, and has sent deputies to Bolivar.—Bolivar has obtained possession of Santa Fee, where he was received with acclamations of welcome from the inhabitants; he here obtained three millions of dollars, and many prisoners. He has left St. Fee for the purpose of opposing Gen. Morillo, the royal commander.

The provinces of Venezuela and New-Grenada, by a decree, dated 17th Dec. 1819, have taken the name of the REPUBLIC OF COLUMBIA; and it has been stated that an Ambassador extraordinary will proceed to this country. In the war which has now continued ten years, it is supposed that 250,000 souls have been lost.

SUMMARY.

\$12,529 have been collected in New-York for the Savannah sufferers.—The state of Pennsylvania has transmitted to Savannah \$10,000.—The inhabitants of Augusta, Geo. have also forwarded the sum of \$6585.—The Governor of Georgia has, on his own responsibility, drawn from the treasury \$10,000, for the relief of the city, and the inhabitants of Wilmington, N. C. have declined receiving the contribution which the citizens of Savannah made for their relief previously to the fire in the latter city. Liberal remittances

have also been received from various towns, theatres, &c.

The legislature of Pennsylvania has granted a lottery for the sale of the stock of the American edition of Rees' Cylopædia, amounting to \$100,000.

A proposition is before the legislature of New-Jersey to incorporate a company for the purpose of opening a canal between the tide waters of the Delaware and the Rariton rivers.

It is stated that 'the Court of Naples has concluded a treaty with the Brazils, for placing at the disposal of the latter 2000 galley slaves, to be selected from such as are condemned for a longer period than 15 years. They are to have lands allotted to them, and their wives and children will accompany them. There will remain 5000 slaves in the Neapolitan dominions.

It appears that in the Armory of the U. States, at Springfield, Mass. there are employed from 240 to 250 men, who manufacture about 45 muskets daily. This armory was established in 1794 and 1795.—At the end of Dec. 1819, there had been completed 152,559 muskets, 1292 carbines, and 46414 muskets repaired. The buildings, &c cost \$166,136; the other expenses, exclusive of stock were \$1,906,440.

The British Government are building, and have given orders for building the following vessels—3 of 120 guns, 1 of 106, 2 of 104, 8 of 84, 1 of 80, 6 of 74, 5 of 60, 1 of 50, 29 of 46, 13 of 28, 8 of 20, 22 sloops of 10 guns, 6 bombs, and 2 cutters—total 100 vessels.

The postage of a newspaper from London to Paris amounts to two francs; (about thirty eight cents.)

Richard Heathfield Esq. has published an essay on the liquidations of the public debt of Great Britain. He proposes an assessment of fifteen per cent on real estate. A deduction of 15 per cent from the Fundholder, and the Unfunded debt would give a relief of

£125,158,982 4 2.

The tax of 15 per cent on private property, would amount to

£375,000,000 0 0.

Total £500,158,982 4 2

He proposes to allow land holders ten years for the payment of the assessment, with the interest. Such a measure would reduce the debt to about 250 millions, and would relieve the country from burdens to the amount of £36,000,000 per annum.

Slave Trade.—6,474 blacks were entered at the custom-house, Havanna, from the 1st of September to the 31st of December.

Obituary.

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.

SIR,

With the remarks of A. Z. on the communication of Amicus, in an early number of your interesting work, I have been much pleased; and think they must be approved by every reflecting mind.

The ground there taken, must be considered a full vindication of the practice, so far as it obtains, of relating the particulars of death-bed scenes.

It is proper to show *how*

"The chamber where the good man meets
his fate,

"Is privileged beyond the common walks
of virtuous life,
quite in the verge of heaven."

Influenced by these considerations, I proceed to commit to your disposal, the following brief recital of the most interesting incidents, and the closing scene, of the life of Mrs. Abigail Williams, who died in Norwich, in the month of April last, aged fifty-nine years.

The place of her death, was also the place of her birth, and here are recorded all her earthly hopes and joys, —her griefs and agonies.

Her earliest years were peculiarly marked with the kindness of Providence. Of a naturally amiable and sprightly disposition, she was thus far prepared for the high enjoyment of her lot. The eldest of the family, and surrounded by an affectionate group of brothers and sisters, her childhood and youth glided most pleasantly and imperceptibly by.

At the age of nineteen, she was happily connected with Gen. Joseph Williams, a gentleman of high respectability, of extensive mercantile engagements, and in very prosperous circumstances.

Scarcely had she become a parent, when she was made to feel the value and importance of the relation, by the removal of an affectionate mother.

It is not known whether this afflictive event had any peculiar effect in in-

fluencing her religious views and feelings. She was early trained to correct opinions on essential points; and she was occasionally, through the season of childhood, the subject of many tender impressions. As she advanced in life, she became more uniformly thoughtful and serious.

The operation of grace upon her heart was silent; but it was soon manifest to those around her, that there was a progress, which promised a fixed and permanent christian character. For some years, however, she hardly ventured to express the hope which she secretly cherished. But having for a very considerable period, with great uniformity, exhibited the excellencies of the renewed spirit, in the various relations sustained, and duties to which she was called;—she at length professed herself a disciple of the Saviour. The issue of her eventful life has confirmed the hope that this solemn act was ratified in heaven. It was in the height of worldly prosperity that she thus vowed allegiance to the Lord; and amid the smiles of Providence, she did not forget the humility and active benevolence, which should visibly characterize the saint. It was more manifest, still, to others than to herself, that she was conscientiously obedient to the precepts, and studious of a strict conformity to the example of her Divine Master.

When the outward circumstances, and earthly prospects of the rising family, were suddenly altered, by one of the frequent vicissitudes of trade, the native dignity of her character, and the ennobling inspiration of grace, were conspicuous.

Within a few months, and under circumstances of peculiar aggravation, her name was written *widow*. She was left in a state of great debility, with a family of ten children, most of them quite young, and one an infant.

Meekly submissive under this distressing bereavement, with filial confidence she cast all her cares upon Him who has graciously proclaimed himself the widow's God, and the Father of the fatherless:—And in Him, the widow, and the fatherless found mercy.

Of St. Paul, on his conversion, the Saviour said "I will shew him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake." And as he by peculiar grace was prepared for peculiar trials; so saints of later times are prepared for the severe afflictions before them, that the power of grace may be more conspicuous.

This remark is strikingly applicable to the case before us.—We have seen how unclouded and brilliant was her early prospect, and how fair and full was the promise of uninterrupted earthly joy;—but her sky was soon overcast, and the storms of adversity beat with increasing vehemence upon her.

They whose first years are passed in the indulgences of prosperity, are not usually best prepared for scenes like these.

Her fortitude, however, augmented, as her trials increased; and she was enabled to discharge with fidelity, the numerous and arduous duties of her responsible station. Her children, all grown up to manhood, under the dews of maternal counsels and prayers, can bear testimony that, if they have not become wise unto salvation, it is to be ascribed, not to any delinquency on her part, but to their own misimprovement of the religious culture with which they have been favored, and their neglect of the precious, and ever memorable example which they have had continually before them.

For many years she was kindly spared to them; and having trained them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, she had the happiness of seeing some of them *walking in the truth*.

It was her lot also, to mourn over one child, amiable and beloved, who mysteriously perished in the prime of life, and found a nameless grave amidst the billows of the deep. On this dispensation, she could not but adopt the apostrophe of the Psalmist,—"*Thy way, O God! is in the sea, and thy path in the great waters, and thy footsteps are not known.*"—Yet, reflecting that the Lord had done it, she could say, "*It is well.*"

But He who ordained this afflictive and mysterious event, was preparing to show her family, by another, and more distressing visitation, that *clouds and darkness are round about him*. Her

earthly trials were to be consummated by an almost unprecedented accumulation of personal sufferings and agonies, which should be left untold, but for the happy illustration they furnish of the rich supports afforded by the gracious presence of God with his people, in their severest distresses.

The trials which had hitherto been sent upon her, seemed to have had their legitimate operation upon her heart,—to have brought her into a state of sweet submission to the divine will; to have weaned her from the world; and made her more spiritual, more meet for heaven.

And if she might not be spared longer, to behold the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living; might she not, at least, be permitted to approach the "dark valley," by some one of the thousand avenues which have less of anguish and of horror?—Had some ministering spirit gently whispered that the "Summons" was at hand; and admonished her friends that soon they should see her face no more; at the same time announcing that the process of discipline was through, and that nothing remained to her but a speedy and easy transition to the presence of her Saviour, and to her heavenly inheritance; they might have said,—"*It is enough!*"—But He who ruleth among the children of men, had other purposes; such as could not be anticipated, and such as were eminently calculated to try her faith and patience.

A tumour of inconsiderable size, had for some months been observed upon the upper part of her face, but causing no pain, had excited no serious apprehensions. As it gradually increased, an inflammation ensued; and it soon became so painful and swollen, as to occasion deep solicitude. Various means were tried for her relief, but without any other effect than a temporary mitigation of the anguish. The nature of the evil had not hitherto been ascertained; but now, its swift and destructive progress clearly indicated that it was an occult cancer, mysteriously fulfilling its ministry of woe.

Amid her anguish, and apprehensions, she maintained a steady confidence in the wisdom and kindness of her God; and a calm submission to his will. In anticipation of the method of treatment which was likely to be recommended, it was her desire to be

directed entirely by intimations of the Divine pleasure. A consultation of surgeons was held on the case; the result of which was, that an operation was the only *possible* remedy; and yet that the *probability* of any essential benefit was so small, they could not, with confidence and decision, *recommend* a measure *certainly* severe, and which might be *fruitless*.

It was accordingly left entirely with her to determine whether they should proceed or not. During the evening she appeared agitated in contemplation of the fearful crisis which had arrived;—but He was with her, whose presence is light in darkness.

In the morning, giving glory to God for his kind interposition in removing all her fears, she declared her determination and her readiness to submit to the course which had been suggested. She had not been flattered with any prospect of essential relief, nor did she indulge sanguine expectations of a favorable result; but she was moved by views of duty alone, to try all means for the preservation of life.

The operation occupied forty minutes—minutes prolonged, by intensity of anguish, to hours.

During this scene, some female members of the Church with which she was connected, were in another room, engaged in fervent prayer for her, that her strength might not fail.

The entreaty of these sympathizing friends prevailed; and the sufferer was enabled to bear the anguish with true christian heroism:—her *spirit leaned on God*. She afterwards expressed her deep conviction that nothing but the divine presence could have sustained her through such protracted agony; and that their zealous interest was instrumental in bringing down that heavenly aid, which they so warmly invoked.

The immediate effect of the operation was more favorable than had been anticipated; and her acknowledgments of divine mercy in the temporary relief she experienced, were unremitted.

Until about the fifth day previous to her death, there was some hope of ultimate benefit. Aware, however, that her state was critical, she improved this period of comparative ease, in imparting pious counsel to her children and friends.

An unfavorable change of symptoms soon indicated that the day of her de-

parture was at hand. The intimation was clear to her own mind; and she received it with pious tranquility. A state ensued, resulting probably in part from the operation, and partly from the natural progress of the disease, which was not eradicated—very nearly allied to the Tetanus.

It will be readily perceived, that her sufferings from this time must have been extreme. Thus she continued until her death, sometimes agonized, and then favored with a momentary quietness. Still, as opportunity was afforded, she spoke to her children, and those around her, of that Redeemer in whom she trusted, and of that grace which she found sufficient for her.

On the Saturday evening previous to her death, after being convulsed with agony, she entreated her children to be composed, and said with eyes raised to heaven, and hands clasped, “O, Lord Jesus, prepare me to go in a moment;” adding, “I think I cannot live through another such turn.”

She soon had another spasm, and was thought to be dying: many relatives coming in, she desired them all to be silent, and appeared to be fervently engaged in prayer. She then requested them to “pray that she might have an easy passage over Jordan;” and a few moments after, was heard saying in a low voice, “I am almost through; and His rod, and His staff, they comfort and sustain me.”

On the following morning, a physician coming in, she asked with peculiar solemnity, “When shall I stop breathing?” Such was her anguish, that even to breathe was almost insupportable;—and immediately addressing her Saviour, she exclaimed, “Good Lord Jesus! come quickly!”

This day was indeed a Sabbath to her soul: she felt that her eternal Sabbath was near, and rejoiced in anticipation of that rest which remaineth to the people of God. She requested one to repeat “The dying Christian to his soul”—into the spirit of which she was fully prepared to enter. To her daughters she expressed regret at their detention from the sanctuary, as it was the communion season;—“But Jesus can be present with us here:”—She then requested them to sing a hymn, that she might have the satisfaction of spiritual fellowship with the saints around the table.

On Monday morning she said, “Is

it possible I have come to the close of life, and feel so much composure?"—and then repeated at intervals the lines: "Let me languish into life"—"Linger about these mortal shores!"

As her father, an aged venerable saint, stood by her bed-side, deeply pondering, with a grieved, yet tranquil spirit, on this visitation—looking upon him she caught his feelings, and said with the utmost tenderness of filial affection, "You see I am going before you: God bless you, protect you, preserve you, and carry you safely through—Farewell!"

She expressed to her friends a desire "to be carried out of the world in the arms of prayer." She was conscious that her last day was come; and though it was a day of agony, it was also a day of peace and transport. While able to speak, she continued to bear testimony to the goodness of God.—After she became speechless, and her friends thought her unconscious, to one who, taking her hand, put the inquiry, she intimated by an affectionate clasp, that "all was peace within." Patient, though suffering, she waited until about three o'clock in the afternoon, when the happy spirit left the frail and fallen fabric.

And now, what to her, are all the trials of the present life? they have passed away as a vision of the night. Removed far from this tumultuous scene of changes and sufferings, with all her recollections of past vicissitudes she mingles thanksgiving unto God, who ordained them in wisdom and in love, and who now shews her their influence in accelerating her fitness for the glory which hath followed. And may it not be suggested, that even *here*, all her sufferings were counterbalanced by the increasing evidence of her interest in the divine favor, furnished in the peculiar supports she received.—For she felt that the promise was fulfilled: "When thou passest through

the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee: when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burnt; neither shall the flame kindle upon thee."

It has been already intimated, that through the former part of life, her hopes of spiritual safety were by no means sanguine. She frequently expressed a wish for more satisfactory views of her own condition. She had experienced such afflictions as are common to mankind; and had sustained them with fortitude—she hoped with true submission; she cherished the belief that her trials had been sent in parental kindness, and that they had resulted in her essential improvement. Still, she was not without apprehensions; but trembled when she thought upon the deceitfulness of the heart.

In her solicitude, she even expressed a desire to have her professed christian graces put to a severer test than had been hitherto applied, before she should be brought to the *decisive trial*. And so it was appointed unto her! and she came forth from the furnace of affliction, as gold purified seven times. She found one continually beside her, who was *like unto the Son of God*; the testimonies of her adoption were rich and abundant; she rejoiced, she triumphed.

How abundant is the consolation thus flowing, to her surviving friends, from the very circumstances which, in themselves, were so fraught with bitter anguish! O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! Unto others also who may be in heaviness, through manifold afflictions, may the trial of their faith, though it be tried with fire, be found unto praise and honour, and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ.

VERUS.

Answers to Correspondents.

W. B.; KNOX; MIKROTEROS; two communications from X.; Q. X.; SOLICITOR, MELANCTHON; PARENS, and several communications without signatures, have been received and are under consideration.

ERRATUM.—In our number for January, page 16, second column, for *power of the people*, read *power of the Pope*.